



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 25, 2006

No. 67

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: With living faith and open hearts we lift our minds in thoughtful prayer to You, O God.

By Your grace, raise us up to be mindful of eternal truths. Although You speak to us through the holy scripture and by divine inspirations, we can all too easily be bogged down by the problems of the day and only selfish designs.

Help us this day to turn to You in all our necessities. With hearts fixed on Your loving concern for all Your people, bless our work of public service; and place in our hearts a longing to share in Your eternal glory, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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. Will the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BONNER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BONNER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 357. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Month.

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

S. 1773. An act to resolve certain Native American claims in New Mexico, and for other purposes.

HONORING SPEAKER HASTERT

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

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of you. This June, you will become the longest-serving Republican Speaker in history. Your leadership has guided our Nation through times of great tragedy and great joy.

You have led our country with a selfless dedication to our Founding Fathers' beliefs in the pursuit of life, liberty and happiness. Our country, this Congress, our party, owes you a great debt, and I wanted to rise today to thank you for your service during this time you are being maligned through irresponsible leaks by an unaccountable bureaucrat. Thank you always for remaining above the fray.

SPYING AND THE FBI

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, amidst the debate nationally about the tracking of calls of millions of Americans, questions about bureaucratic leaks here on Capitol Hill, and evidence that we are awash in information, the FBI approached an employee in Portland City Hall last week to solicit her to spy on activities there.

Mr. Speaker, the FBI has had a long and shameful history of spying on American citizens, information that Director J. Edgar Hoover used literally to blackmail people in government and treated Martin Luther king shame-

fully. It prompted some of my conservative friends to call for ripping his name off the FBI headquarters.

It is time for the FBI to get its priorities straight. Remember, this is the institution that couldn't deal with information it had before 9/11 about potential airplane hijackers.

If evidence of wrongdoing is in place, jump on it, but don't establish a spy network trolling for information. Let us keep the FBI on its important work. The American public deserves it.

NATIONAL MISSING KIDS DAY

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

Mr. FOLEY. Madam Speaker, let me associate myself with the words of the gentleman from Virginia in strong support of our team leader, Coach HASTERT, Speaker HASTERT, a decent, honorable man who has led this Chamber in an incredibly fair and responsible manner. Shame on those false reports.

Let me also alert our colleagues—today is National Missing Kids Day. Every day, 2,000 children go missing. Even though many are returned home safely, many are still unaccounted for. Sexual predators roam free, foisting their sickness on the most vulnerable. Despite our success in recent years of tracking down our missing kids, much more needs to be done.

If you watched recent episodes of Dateline or America's Most Wanted, online predators have a pervasive and sickening impact on our children.

There are over 5,000 registered sex offenders in this country, and 150,000 of them go without any kind of checking in or any kind of tracking. We track library books better than our sexual predators. We have to stop playing Russian roulette with our children's lives.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H3229

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND
SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, today this House will consider the Homeland Security Appropriations bill, a bill I support for funding the safety of our communities and the security of our country.

While I am proud this Congress is putting real dollars behind homeland security preparedness programs, it is not enough for us to simply write a check. We must play a more active role. We must engage, discuss, and oversee how that check is being spent.

To that end I am working on legislation to authorize in law within the Department the programs most needed back home: the grants for all-hazards emergency planning, supplies needed to carry out those plans, medical and search and rescue support, and antiterrorism and urban area security grants. These grant programs deserve our careful attention, not just simply a brief line in our budget.

We all agree that we need to refocus on all-hazards emergency preparedness. I look forward to working with my colleagues to authorize these programs so that our first responders can depend on us.

ABC NEWS REPORT REGARDING
THE HON. DENNIS HASTERT,
SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE

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

Mr. BONNER. Madam Speaker, as a journalism student at the University of Alabama in the late 1970s and early 1980s, I was a member of Sigma Delta Chi, the Society of Professional Journalists. Sigma Delta Chi is the gold standard upon which the journalism profession is based. Among other ideals, Sigma Delta Chi, in its mission statement, encourages excellence among journalists and the need to stimulate high standards and ethical behavior in the practice of journalism.

Sadly, Madam Speaker, ABC News, both last night and again this morning, is guilty of throwing high standards and ethical behavior out the window. Their report that our Speaker, DENNY HASTERT of Illinois, is being investigated by the Justice Department lacks one essential element to a good news story: the facts. Even after the Justice Department issued a 10-word statement that said "Speaker HASTERT is not under investigation by the Justice Department," ABC refuses to retract this story. Instead, they cite an unnamed source in the Justice Department as the only evidence they need to throw trash into the mainstream.

Freedom of the press is a precious liberty. It should never be taken for

granted, nor, my friends, should it be trampled on by people who stand behind this ideal instead of standing on the bedrock principle of getting the facts right and reporting the truth.

DRILLING IN THE ALASKA
NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, in the Book of Genesis, Esau, hungry and believing he was about to die, sold his birthright to Jacob for a pot of red stew. The Alaska National Wildlife Refuge is the birthright of the Gwich'in Tribe as well as a national treasure of natural beauty.

Are we, like Esau, about to sell our birthright to corporations for a mess of oily pottage? Are we ready to despoil our natural heritage in search of liquid fool's gold?

It is time for new thinking. Instead of the oil companies taking over ANWR for drilling, we ought to be talking about taking over the oil companies. They have gouged the American people. They control our politics. They have ignored the growing global environmental crisis. They have defeated alternative energies. The lust for oil has put us on a path toward war.

It is time for new thinking. We should be talking about a windfall profits tax, breaking up the oil monopolies, or even taking over the oil companies, not sacrificing ANWR. Esau thought his birthright didn't mean much. Will we, like Esau, come to regret that we never claimed our right to control over our natural resources, our own environment, our own Nation?

IN SUPPORT OF THE SPEAKER OF
THE HOUSE, THE HON. DENNIS
HASTERT

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

Mr. TERRY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of our Speaker, DENNY HASTERT, a gentleman whom I wholeheartedly trust and believe that he is one of the most ethical stand-up people I have ever met in my life. And most of us know that around here, and that is why a story about his being investigated is so unbelievable that it should not run.

Now, in Washington when a Speaker has criticized an action of the Justice Department on a constitutional ground, I guess we should not be surprised that there is retaliation from those that have been criticized. But let us realize what that is: retaliation.

Now, what frustrates me even more or frightens me even more than retaliation by an executive agency like this is the fact that a news station so desirous of bringing down Washington, DC and the representatives here would run a

false story about an investigation on the Speaker when the Justice Department said there is no investigation. This noncredible journalism, I think, degrades freedom of speech and the reputation of journalists.

HONORING FORMER SENATOR
LLOYD BENTSEN AND OUR VET-
ERANS

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, first, I would like to take just a moment to acknowledge the passing of Senator Lloyd Bentsen, the former vice presidential candidate and as well, the former Secretary of the Treasury and a dear beloved friend of this institution. To his wife and his family, I offer my deepest reflection of his leadership, his service to this country as a World War II veteran. We will always remember him and for a moment I will be silent in his honor.

On another matter in keeping with the spirit of acknowledging our veterans, I rise today to express enormous concern as we honor those fallen in battle. Yet we must remember those who are here, injured, harmed, traumatized by wars like Vietnam, Iraq, and others. It is shameful that we have found that in this body we have depleted the TRICARE system and, for one, we have forgotten the military families and we are constantly taking moneys away from the veterans hospital and veterans' health care. And I guess the ultimate concern as I go home to interact with my community and my veterans is the stealing of records of our veterans. The identity theft that has put them in such jeopardy.

My office will be open to any veteran who has a concern, and we will be standing with the families to protect their identity, and that identity theft against our Nation's veterans will be investigated. Shame. Shame. Shame. In their time of honor we owe the loved ones of the fallen soldiers our debt of gratitude; and we owe our veterans and their families our continued support.

AMERICAN VOICE: ERNEST
FICHTNER

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, we have seen the protests of illegals who have colonized our Nation, parading through our streets, trying to intimidate America.

But they are not alone. Their shouts and demands are being met by a silent revolution. Countless native citizens and naturalized citizens are demanding to be heard as well. Their voice is being echoed across these lands.

Ernest Fichtner writes: "My heart goes out to the Mexican people who

look north for a chance at life and liberty. But this problem sits squarely in the lap of Vicente Fox and his corrupt government.

“We are a Nation of laws and institutions. If the laws are not vigorously enforced, we are left with anarchy and open borders. . . .

“If America does the hard work now, the border integrity of this country will never again be subject to attack, not only from without but from within.”

Madam Speaker, we are a Nation of American citizens, not illegal invaders, not lawbreakers, not tax dodgers, not transients.

This land is our land. This land is not Vicente Fox’s land. The last thing we need is amnesty anarchy.

And that’s just the way it is.

□ 1015

CULTURE OF CORRUPTION ON THE RX BILL: REPUBLICANS NEGOTIATE IN BAD FAITH

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, we have talked about the culture of corruption here, and it is very interesting that the way I see the culture of corruption is what we do right here on this floor.

Today’s seniors are paying the price for a prescription drug plan that does not have their best interests in mind. Rather, it is a plan that was created to actually help the special interests. Why couldn’t we have a plan in Medicare? Why? Because that is not what the insurance companies want in the law.

They helped to write the bill, and now the persons who worked with them are representing them. So since the time of the law passing, three of the main Republican negotiators are making very large sums of money.

Madam Speaker, the American people don’t like what they see here. They see a Republican majority that is too close to the special interests, and they want Washington to work for the people and work for you again.

HOUSE SPEAKER MALIGNED BY NATIONAL BROADCAST MEDIA

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, “jingoism,” “yellow journalism,” all words that I used to teach in U.S. history class. I have never been a vocal critic of the state of the national broadcast media, but ABC News has caused me to reconsider.

The two-source rule for accusation has been lost on many of the national media. Now, when Speaker HASTERT is nearing a historic landmark, he is maligned.

On May 31, Speaker HASTERT will become the longest serving Republican Speaker in the history of the House of Representatives. You get this by being fair, honest, open and hard-working.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to serve with you.

BACKDATING OF STOCK OPTIONS

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Madam Speaker, this may sound strange coming from a Democrat, but I am here to applaud the Wall Street Journal for its work in uncovering a major corporate scandal.

After Enron and WorldCom, we enacted Sarbanes-Oxley to usher in a new era of corporate responsibility. But now a new scandal is brewing, this time involving the backdating of stock options.

When a company backdates stock options, it deliberately moves option grants back to dates when the stock price was lower, ensuring the options will make money for executives while hiding its real cost from shareholders and the IRS. It is free and cheap money for the CEO, and securities fraud for everyone else, plain and simple.

So far, United Healthcare appears to be the biggest perpetrator, but the problem now is spreading to 15 other public companies that are under investigation at this point.

Madam Speaker, the American people don’t deserve another Enron or WorldCom. They deserve an era of corporate responsibility that they were promised from this institution. As the SEC and the Justice Department pursue these cases, I hope they will take swift and decisive action to punish those involved and restore investor confidence in our markets.

THANKING SPEAKER HASTERT FOR HIS LEADERSHIP

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

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I also rise today in support of the principled leadership of the Speaker of the House, Mr. DENNIS HASTERT.

As we all know, Denny is a former high school wrestling coach, and he brings those same values of teamwork and fair play to his work here in Congress. It is often said that to be a good leader, one must first be a good listener, and DENNY’s door is always open to every Member.

Under his leadership, this House has passed scores of legislation benefiting American families, children, seniors, taxpayers. We have achieved historic tax reform, a prescription drug benefit for our seniors and legislation to secure our border and prepare our military.

Madam Speaker, last night’s news report’s attempt to cast a shadow on Mr.

HASTERT, despite the fact that the Justice Department has categorically refuted ABC News claims about the Speaker, this is a case of sensationalism over reporting and it should not continue.

Madam Speaker, I know this Congress will continue to focus on passing good legislation for the American people and not resort to muckraking and partisan attacks. I know all my colleagues in this Chamber join me in thanking Speaker HASTERT for his leadership.

FARMERS DESPERATELY NEED DISASTER ASSISTANCE

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

Mr. POMEROY. Madam Speaker, rural America is anxiously awaiting the deliberations taking place regarding the relief for those who experienced 2005 crop failure. Farmers across the country have just completed the most expensive spring planting in the history of U.S. agriculture, and for those carrying the debt from last year due to disaster losses in reaping their crop, it has pushed them to the brink of bankruptcy.

The Senate has committed on a bipartisan basis meaningful disaster assistance, when the House Appropriations Committee voted it down on a party line vote with Republicans opposing. Now in conference committee, we have learned that House Republicans are doing their dead level best to strip this assistance our farmers need so badly out of the legislation.

Farmers of this country need to know if disaster assistance efforts fall short, it was the majority, the House Republicans, that stood in the way and prevented us from getting the disaster assistance they so desperately need.

IN STRONG SUPPORT OF SPEAKER HASTERT

(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. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of our Speaker, DENNIS HASTERT, who will soon become the longest serving Republican Speaker in our Nation’s history.

Speaker HASTERT guides this House in a bipartisan, fair manner. He is a patient listener who works towards compromise in an even-handed manner. In these days of rancor and bitterness, Speaker HASTERT tries to bring balance and civility into this tumultuous legislative process.

It is irresponsible for media outlets to malign anyone with negative information from unnamed and uncorroborated sources. Speaker HASTERT and everyone else who might be attacked deserves to have incorrect information corrected for the record.

Our Speaker has not been a Republican or a Democrat presiding officer, he has been the presiding officer for the whole House, a man who takes his oath seriously. We place our trust in Speaker HASTERT, and he has not let us down. He is our coach.

Congratulations, Speaker HASTERT, for this historic milestone.

TIME FOR NEW MANAGEMENT IN THE HOUSE

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

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, my oldest son Jack is a carpenter, and one of the reasons I am so proud of him is he is such a hard worker. It doesn't matter how hard it is raining out in Seattle, he is out there swinging the hammer.

That is one reason we should not respect the current pathetic management team of the Republican Party who is on a course to make this Congress the least productive Congress in American history, for one reason, because we don't do any work.

Of the 5 months that we have been here, we are on a track to work about 38 days. If you have an employee that out of 5 months does 38 days of work, what do you think you ought to do? Unemployment. A pink slip for the folks who are not running this Congress.

In Truman's time, we had the do-nothing Congress. This is the do-less-than-nothing Congress. If you want to know why there is no progress on Iraq, why there is no progress on energy, why there is no progress on helping the folks after Katrina, it is because the people here in this management stay home and don't do any work.

It is time to start swinging a hammer, and, to do that, it is time to get new management in this House and get Congress working for the American people again.

MEXICO'S HYPOCRISY

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

Mr. McHENRY. Madam Speaker, Cox News Service reported last week that the Mexican government threatened to file lawsuits against the United States if the National Guard troops detain aliens at the border trying to cross illegally into this country.

Mexico's liberals, the liberal party, called President Bush's decision unjustified, unacceptable and implies a serious aggression toward a sovereign nation. That is simply because we are defending our borders.

Let's talk about Mexico. What is striking here is that foreign born Mexicans can't even hold office in either house of their congress. They are also banned from state legislatures, The supreme court and all governorships.

We don't do that here in America. We allow immigrants to participate in the process.

In fact, they are even encouraging a ban on firefighters, police and judges from being non-natives. It is amazing to me what Mexico is doing.

Madam Speaker, we are a Nation that respects immigrants and embraces them, unlike Mexico, and I just ask their respect of their immigrants as well.

SECURING CITIZENSHIP FOR THOSE SERVING OUR COUNTRY

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

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, to all those that are going to be celebrating this Memorial Day weekend, my special condolences go to the soldiers and their families that have given their lives so bravely and courageously. In fact, in my district in Los Angeles, 11 soldiers were killed, the first soldier being Francisco Martinez Flores, who is a green card soldier.

He was not a full-fledged citizen, but he honored us by fighting for us and defending our freedom in Iraq. I found out later that his parents were not here legally. But through the work of some of the Members on our side of the aisle, we worked very diligently to secure citizenship for those serving in our country.

Why could we not honor these soldiers beforehand, when they enter in and help to define who we are as a country? He was granted posthumous citizenship. When I read about that, I moved quickly to see how we could assure that no other soldier who came home in a coffin or a body bag would be given just that identification on their grave, that they be granted full citizenship, and that their families have every right to the same securities that any other citizen has in this country.

Let's remember Francisco Flores and the 10 other soldiers that have given their lives, most of whom were Latinos from my district, proud Latinos, who carried their uniform and their bravery with them.

ABC NEWS REDUCING CREDIBILITY OF NATIONAL MEDIA

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

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, last night, ABC Nightly News in the height of irresponsibility reported that the Department of Justice is "investigating Speaker Hastert." That report has been denied by both parties.

Such a blatant falsehood comes at a time when the Speaker of the House has reached out to work with our friends on the other side of the aisle to ensure that the separation of powers within the Constitution is fully upheld.

It is sad to say that at a time of declining and questionable journalistic standards, with an increasingly shrill and partisan ideological media, at a time when national news broadcasts seem to have more of the flavor of entertainment than hard news, ABC News has written a sad new chapter in the annals of yellow journalism.

I support a free press. I believe it is a fundamental institution that is central to a free society. But ABC News, Madam Speaker, has, at a stroke, reduced the credibility of our national media. Mr. HASTERT's reputation, however, remains impeccable among those of us who have had the privilege of working with him.

ADMINISTRATION PUTTING NATION'S VETERANS AT RISK

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

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, once again the administration has put our Nation's veterans at risk. First it was underfunding the Veterans Administration services in fiscal year 2006, and now it is a security breach of 27 million veterans' personal information.

The administration has jeopardized tens of millions of veterans' financial futures because they have failed to implement safeguards and adequate security measures at the request of the VA Inspector General. This information was known for 19 days before we found it out.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the 42,000 veterans that I represent, I call upon the President to act immediately to safeguard these brave veterans from identity fraud. We must protect our veterans who have protected us. It is the right thing to do.

DEFENDING THE SPEAKER FROM FALSE ACCUSATIONS

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, the press has reached a new low in this country. I am appalled that ABC World News Tonight ran a false story claiming that our Speaker of the House, who is of the utmost integrity, is under investigation by the Justice Department.

How convenient for them to mistakenly accuse the Speaker of the massive corruption that a Democrat Congressman is charged with, and then use the capabilities that only the mass media possesses to deliver that lie into the living rooms of every American.

Let me read to you the Justice Department's press release issued yesterday. Here it is. Before ABC ran its blatantly false story, this press release did not mince words and said, "Speaker Hastert is not under investigation by the Justice Department."

Enough said.

HONORING HOWARD A.
CHRISTIANSON

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

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and celebrate Howard A. Christianson, a resident of Washington's Second Congressional District, whose life has been defined by his service to his country, his family and his community. I congratulate Mr. Christianson on receiving the first-ever Stillaguamish Senior Center Lifetime Achievement Award.

My hometown of Arlington, Washington, has benefited from 25 years of Mr. Christianson's vision and guidance as a city councilman, mayor and city administrator. His legacy of leadership extends beyond his public service to civic service as well.

He has been active in the Kiwanis Club, American Legion, VFW and the Shriners, and his years of work with the Masonic Lodge have inspired leaders to name the lodge's new citizen of the year award the Howard A. Christianson Outstanding Citizenship Award.

Madam Speaker, we should all be so fortunate to have community members back home in our districts who so visibly represent the meaning of service and leadership. At a time when many Americans are feeling disengaged from their communities and their leaders, Howard Christianson stands out as a shining example of why we must continue to serve and to lead for the sake of our country and for our communities.

□ 1030

HONORING SPEAKER HASTERT

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to add my voice to the many here this morning in support of our Speaker and my neighbor from Illinois, DENNIS HASTERT.

In so doing, I would ask three questions: Is the price of leadership defamation of character? Is the punishment for defending this body and its Members rumor, innuendo and false leaks? Is the cost of speaking the truth and upholding the Constitution greater than the need for flashy headlines?

The answer to all three must be no. Speaker HASTERT is one of the finest men I have ever known. His integrity is unquestioned. Let's stop the witch hunt, let's shake the gotcha mentality, and let's put an end to the unjust attacks on those who bear the heavy responsibility of leadership.

DO-NOTHING CONGRESS REFUSES
TO DO ANYTHING ABOUT THE
HIGH COST OF GAS

(Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARNAHAN. Madam Speaker, with Memorial Day approaching, it would be nice if the Republican-controlled House had actually done something about gas prices that continue to hover about \$3 a gallon.

Over the past 5 years, we have seen gas prices double what they were when President Bush took office. American families are now spending about \$1,500 more a year on transportation than they did 5 years ago. Gas prices are taking a big bite out of American family budgets.

And yet for 5 years, Washington Republicans have chosen to pad the pockets of Big Oil rather than provide real relief to consumers or sufficient resources for alternative energy. Last year they signed an energy bill into law that was nothing more than a \$20 billion gift to Big Oil.

It is no wonder that Big Oil continues to reap record profits, including nearly \$30 billion for the six largest oil companies in the first quarter of this year alone. House Republicans are unwilling to provide real relief to American consumers because of their cozy relationship with Big Oil.

Despite what Republicans claim this week, drilling in ANWR is not a solution to our energy crisis.

HONORING SPEAKER HASTERT

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

Mr. WELLER. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor to congratulate the Speaker of the House. I have known DENNY HASTERT since the late 1970s. I remember DENNY HASTERT as a high school wrestling coach, history teacher. The Yorkville Foxes would come down to our high school and pretty much beat us every year under the leadership of Coach HASTERT.

When I met DENNY HASTERT, he was a public school teacher interested in public service, thinking about running for State legislature, volunteering to campaign. Today he is Speaker of the House. One thing I have always known about DENNY HASTERT; he is respected as a listener. He is a solid leader, a man of integrity.

But I want to congratulate the Speaker, because this coming week, DENNY HASTERT will become the longest-serving Republican Speaker of the House of Representatives in the history of the United States Congress.

It is my understanding that he will also be the third-longest Speaker in the history of the United States. As a Member of the Illinois Delegation I extend my warm congratulations to DENNY HASTERT, who has been a great Speaker of the House, a man of tremendous integrity. I salute him for his leadership to the House of Representatives and our Nation.

STUDENT SAVINGS ACT OF 2006

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, in 1999, when President Bush was running for office, he made a pledge to veto any tax increase. Well, last week, he did what he said he would never do when he signed into law a tax increase for our Nation's young people.

This Congress passed and the President signed a bill that will triple tax rates for the teenagers with college savings funds. Under the new law, teenagers between the ages of 14 and 17 with investment income who had their long-term capital gains and dividends taxed at 5 percent, will now be taxed at 15.

Interest that had been taxed at 10 percent will now be taxed at as much as 35 percent. So much for savings. So much for education. So much for hypocrisy. The bill passed last week and ironically is called the Tax Increase Prevention Act.

Yet it increased taxes on students. And we have been insisting on tax cuts of billions of dollars to folks who do not need it. It is because of this outrageous tax increase that I have introduced the Student Savings Act of 2006, H.R. 5473. My legislation will be revenue neutral by effectively rescinding those tax cuts that go to those who make \$1 million or more.

We should be giving our students financial incentives and not giving them tax increases.

HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I wanted to call attention that the House Appropriations Committee, working on a bipartisan basis, is ahead of schedule for this year. And although that is what we should be doing, it does seem that sometimes in Washington things break down, and there is no progress that is being made.

Unfortunately, a lot of that is happening in the other body. And then the House doesn't get credit for it. We have had some very good debate on the appropriations bills. We will have them under budget and on time. We are having a lot of push-back from some of our Members about, well, you need to cut this item out of it because there is pork here; there is pork there.

And I can say this, that in a \$2-trillion-plus budget, you can always find lots to criticize about it. I think we should always be on the lookout for more things to cut. But just to take an example, the agriculture bill, we cut 35 different programs out of it, we reduced spending, and we did it on a bipartisan basis.

So often as Members get up to grandstand over one or two particular

things, they totally forget the bigger picture that the committee has done a lot of work already. I want to just say to the House, Democrats and Republicans, I think we are moving in the right direction on appropriations bills. We are going to continue to do so and work together on it.

FBI RAID ON CAPITOL HILL

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I disagree with the bipartisan House leadership criticism of the FBI's search of a Member's office. I know nothing specifically about the case, except that the uncontroverted public evidence did seem to justify the issuance of a warrant.

What we now have is a Congressional leadership, the Republican part of which has said it is okay for law enforcement to engage in warrantless searches of the average citizen, now objecting when a search, pursuant to a validly issued warrant, is conducted of a Member of Congress.

I understand that the speech and debate clause is in the Constitution. It is there because Queen Elizabeth I and King James I were disrespectful of Parliament. It ought to be, in my judgment, construed narrowly. It should not be in any way interpreted as meaning that we as Members of Congress have legal protections superior to those of the average citizen.

So I think it was a grave error to have criticized the FBI. I think what they did, they ought to be able to do in every case where they can get a warrant from a judge. I think, in particular, for the leadership of this House, which has stood idly by while this administration has ignored the rights of citizens, to then say we have special rights as Members of Congress is wholly inappropriate.

HONORING SPEAKER HASTERT

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

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Speaker, I am proud to come down to the floor this morning to show my strong support for my friend and our Speaker, DENNY HASTERT. This is a man of intense integrity, a man of great character, a man who has worked tirelessly to bring honor and as much unity as possible to this institution.

When our former Speaker and successors resigned, we went to DENNY to be our Speaker because he was the right man for the job. He has never let us down. He set the standard for integrity. I would encourage ABC, who thinks it knows truth in its own definition and probably does, I would encourage them to tell the truth and to apologize to the American people for their assault upon the Speaker of the House.

A GOOD OFFENSE IS THE BEST DEFENSE

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, to follow on the words of Mr. FRANK from Massachusetts, I would like to say that we all know that a good offense is the best defense. That is true in any sport, whether it is wrestling or football or basketball.

But I would commend the Speaker and my colleagues to the words of Christ. In Matthew 7:3, He says, "Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye," the press, the FBI, whoever. "Hypocrite, first cast out the beam in thine own eye and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote in thy brother's eye".

Madam Speaker, we have a very unbalanced set of perceptions in this House. If it goes favorable toward us, we think it is wonderful, and we proclaim it.

But if it happens to be unpleasant to us, suddenly, we cannot seem to find enough words to castigate it. This is a House in which the people expect us to be just and even-handed. That is what they expect from us. That is what they should get.

UDALL-SCHWARZ RESOLUTION ON IRAQ

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

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, today with my colleague and friend, Representative JOE SCHWARZ of Michigan, I will introduce a bipartisan resolution that can be the basis for consensus about future military involvement in Iraq.

Our resolution recognizes progress in Iraq, including the establishment of a national unity government last week. But it also recognizes the need for more progress. In particular, it urges the Bush Administration to tell the new Iraqi government that they must seize this opportunity to complete the formation of their new government and agree to modifications in their own constitution.

We need to let the Iraqi government know this is no time for complacency. Iraqi leaders must seize this opportunity to complete the political process which could build trust and legitimacy in the new government and reduce insurgent-led violence and sectarian strife.

Only the Iraqis can unify their country and achieve a lasting peace. Our resolution makes it clear to both the people of Iraq and the American people, the presence of U.S. military forces is linked to Iraqi political achievements and the deadlines the Iraqis have set for themselves in their constitution need to be met.

I urge the support of my colleagues on this important bipartisan resolution.

THE SAFER NET ACT, H.R. 4982

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

Ms. BEAN. Madam Speaker, sadly we have all become familiar with the media reports of online child predators trolling for kids on the Internet networking sites like MySpace, unsuspecting Americans having their lives hijacked by online identity thieves and scams which swindle millions of Americans of their hard-earned money.

While our families want to access the tremendous resources available on the Internet, they now know that there are significant dangers lurking there. Unfortunately, most Americans do not know where to turn to for help. In fact, a Google search on Internet safety returns over 5 million hits.

To assist our families in their efforts to protect themselves, I have introduced H.R. 4982, The SAFER Net Act. This bipartisan effort would do three things: First, it would streamline existing Federal resources to coordinate and promote best practices for safe surfing.

Second, the SAFER Net Act would launch a national public awareness campaign to alert Americans to online threats and how they can protect their loved ones. Finally, this legislation would authorize Federal grants to support efforts that promote Internet safety, conducted by our schools, businesses, local law enforcement agencies and nonprofit organizations.

Madam Speaker, we have the resources in place. We just need to use them better. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4982.

WAGES IN AMERICA

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, the administration continues to mislead the American people about the economy. They boast about how fast wages are growing while ignoring the devastating impact on the real purchasing power of those wages, from higher gasoline prices and other increases in the cost of living.

Treasury Secretary Snow was befuddled at a hearing before the Financial Services Committee when the ranking member, BARNEY FRANK, asked him whether the data he cited on wages had taken inflation into account. It turns out, they had not, and his statistics were meaningless.

The fact is real wages have stagnated for the last 3 years, and this administration's policies are not working to benefit ordinary working Americans.

□ 1045

REAL ACTION NEEDED

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Another real problem confronting America, another symbolic gesture by the Republican leadership. The thirteenth House vote on opening the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge to drilling.

Now, real action would require taking on the price gouging, collusion, and market manipulation of big oil. Reign in the speculation in the commodities market, save 25 cents a gallon. Impose a windfall profits tax, reopen or build new refinery capacity, 70 cents a gallon. Take on the OPEC cartel but no, they are not going to take on big oil and protect American families who are reacting with shock and awe to costs at the pump because it might slow the gusher, the gusher of campaign contributions flowing into the Republican coffers. So families across America will pay 50 bucks to tank up this weekend and the Republicans will pretend they care.

HONORING ROBERT GIAIMO

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

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, the House of Representatives lost a giant this week. Robert N. Giaimo was a profound figure in this body, someone who represented the values, the dreams and aspirations of the people he represented.

For eleven terms he served the Third District of Connecticut that I am now honored to represent. And as a fellow child of Italian immigrants from North Haven, Connecticut, he did so with distinction, with honor and with special purpose.

During his 22 years in the Congress, 1959 to 1980, his contributions were as momentous as they were numerous. Serving during a time of great upheaval in this country, it was Bob Giaimo who led the first successful effort to end funds for the fighting in Southeast Asia. He co-sponsored legislation that led to the creation of the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, unleashing the creative potential of millions of Americans. And when the Congress decide it was time to get control of the Federal budget process, they chose Bob Giaimo to chair that committee which he did with integrity for 4 years.

Bob's priority was always making sure that the work that we did in the Congress, the programs and the funding impacted those who needed it most.

Madam Speaker, the legacy of Congressman Robert Giaimo lives on today in his former staff, some of whom went on to serve in the Connecticut State legislature. It lives on in the people he served in our district for whom he made opportunity real. It lives on in his successors, in the work that I do in the Congress.

Our thoughts and our prayers are with the family, his daughter, B.L., and his wife, Marion.

Bob Giaimo was an inspiration to so many and we will miss him. Just very, very briefly, I can recall being 8 years old when Bob Giaimo went to visit my parents, Louise and Ted DeLauro. He said he was running for the United States Congress and would they support his effort as they were involved in politics as well. They did support that effort. He won the race. I have in my possession, in my family's possession, a letter saying thank you to Louise and Ted DeLauro for their help in getting him elected.

He reached enormous heights, yet he never forgot where he came from.

DEFENDING THE SPEAKER

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Madam Speaker, I rise to address the House for 1 minute regarding DENNY HASTERT, the Speaker of the House.

As many people have previously observed, the Speaker is not under any investigation at the present time. I have been part of a group that meets with DENNY on a weekly basis for the last 2 years and have found this person to be a person of unimpeachable character. He is one that you can take his word to the bank; and so if there is any Member of the House who does not deserve this, it would be DENNY HASTERT.

Sometimes we are all painted with a very broad brush here, and I am very sorry that DENNY has been painted in such a way. I simply wanted to come to the House floor today to register my support, my regard of the Speaker, and the fact that it is very unfortunate that someone of his character would be attacked in this way. And I am sure this applies to others on both sides of the aisle.

RISING GAS PRICES REACHING THE CRISIS STAGE

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, as we approach Memorial Day many of my constituents face the same dilemma as other Americans around the country. With gas prices out of control, many can hardly afford to drive to work, let alone drive on a vacation in their cars.

For 5 years now, House Republicans have refused to offer a real solution to the rising gas prices, choosing instead to rubberstamp CHENEY's energy task force meetings that boosted the profits of big oil while hurting working Americans.

The only plan that Republicans are offering consumers this Memorial Day is to allow drilling in the National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska, a temporary solution which would damage a natural treasure while providing no long term supply of oil. This makes no sense from a practical or environmental standpoint.

Democrats have a better plan. We have an innovative agenda that would help our Nation achieve energy independence within 10 years through clean, sustainable energy alternatives. We will provide tax incentives to encourage increased production of home-grown fuels.

Madam Speaker, let's protect the American consumers so they can once again afford to drive to work and take vacations with their families.

STANDING BEHIND THE SPEAKER

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

Mr. PUTNAM. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to follow my good friend, Coach OSBORNE, to also address the malignment of our Speaker of this great House. No one cares more about the institution of this House than DENNY HASTERT. No one believes in the integrity of this House more than DENNY HASTERT. No Member is more aware of the need for us to be worthy of the respect and dignity that voters place in us when they elect us to serve in this House.

I want to reiterate that the Department of Justice for the second time has affirmed that there is no investigation into the Speaker of this House. And I quote from their release from Deputy Attorney General Paul McNulty, "With regard to reports suggesting that the Speaker of House is under investigation or 'in the mix' as stated by ABC News, I reconfirm, as stated by the Department earlier this evening, that these reports are untrue."

Two separate statements now from the Department of Justice exonerating the Speaker, saying that he is not under investigation, and yet ABC news continues to malign his good name and his reputation. Stand behind the Speaker of the House.

REPUBLICAN CULTURE OF CORRUPTION LEAVES NO ROOM FOR REAL LEADERSHIP

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

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, we have all seen the polls. We know that Americans are unhappy by what they have seen here in Washington. They are looking for real leadership on the important issues of the day and where is the leadership from this Republican Congress?

Madam Speaker, the Republicans control the House. Where are their new ideas to help reduce prices at the pump? Where are their new ideas to help seniors with the new prescription drug disaster plan? Where are their new ideas on how to help college students afford better college? Where are their ideas on how to help everyday Americans struggling to make ends meet or how to get 45 million Americans that lack health coverage, health

coverage? Where are their new ideas to reduce the huge national deficit which happened on their watch leaving our children and grandchildren with debt as far as the eye can see?

Madam Speaker, Democrats have new ideas and are ready to lead this House.

TAX CUTS OR VETERAN BENEFITS

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, a group of House Republicans last week seriously undermined our Nation's ability to fight the war on terror when they objected to more than \$500 million in funding that directly affects our veterans and our soldiers in combat. These were all funds the President said were necessary to properly fund military construction projects and our veterans services. And yet the House Republican leadership allowed these funds to be stripped from the bill by not properly funding these programs in the budget they passed last week.

This small group of House Republicans would not have been able to act against our troops and our veterans if the Republican leadership had been honest about their real funding needs in their budget. House Republicans want Americans to believe that they can continue to provide \$40,000 tax breaks every year to millionaires without negatively impacting critical Federal obligations. But Memorial Day approaches this weekend, House Republicans need to decide whether they want to continue to stick with the wealthiest few or if they want to level with the American people about our true financial commitment to our military and our veterans. It is time they choose.

AMERICAN-MADE ENERGY AND GOOD JOBS ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 835 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 835

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5429) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish and implement a competitive oil and gas leasing program that will result in an environmentally sound program for the exploration, development, and production of the oil and gas resources of the Coastal Plain of Alaska, and for other purposes. The bill shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The gentleman

from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), 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.

House Resolution 835 provides for a closed rule with 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources, waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, and provides for one motion to recommit.

This rule allows this body to, once again, consider important legislation which is a key component of moving our Nation further along towards greater energy independence.

H.R. 5429, the American-Made Energy and Good Jobs Act is appropriately titled. It highlights the fact that the United States has within its borders vast untapped natural energy resources which have been locked away largely because of surreal political rhetoric battles, not based on reality, and it highlights the fact that developing this energy would provide many new jobs to our national economy and support our existing domestic economy.

We drive. We use plastics. Our agriculture uses fertilizers. 90 percent of our food is trucked to us. This is indeed talking about our economic health.

I know in the rhetoric that will take place there will be some emotional consideration that will happen. But I think also in the rhetoric, we will find several facts that will emerge.

Fact number one is there is oil in this area. The U.S. Geological Survey, our own researchers have stated with the probability that is higher than any of the pollsters who will be using our campaigns will say, that there is a minimum of 4.2 billion barrels and a mean factor of 8 billion barrels of oil. They have clearly stated this is the largest on-shore source of petroleum we have in the United States. If this were the only source of energy that we were using, my good friend, Mr. HASTINGS' State, could go for 29 years of energy needs in his State of Florida just with this source alone. My State uses far less air conditioning. We could go for 218 years just from this source alone.

□ 1100

A second fact that will come through. The purpose of this land is for oil exploration. When I first came here, there was a campaign to try and discredit drilling up in this area. They showed pictures of mountains, lush conifers, forests, lakes, meadows. It was a good PR campaign. It would have been a perfect PR campaign if it was true. They were actually using pictures in this area.

Secretary Norton said in the congressional committee in March of 2003, this

is a coastal plain. It is called a coastal plain because it is a plain. There are no mountains, there are no deep water lakes, there are no trout streams. The only trout you will find in this area is frozen.

When Jimmy Carter and the Democrat-controlled legislature of Congress at the time created the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, an area the size of South Carolina. They also created the section known as 10/02. That is not ANWR.

When we were having 10 percent inflation and 10 percent unemployment at the same time, they created an area the size of the State of Delaware if you include the water for the purpose of oil exploration. It was stated at the time that this is where our future energy supply would come. Well, the future is now.

What we are talking about is a million and a half acres, the size of Delaware, with a displacement potential of around 2,000 acres to capture the energy in this particular area. That is roughly the size from the Capitol down to the Air and Space Museum on the lawn, out of an area the size of the State of Delaware. Mathematically, that comes to about .13 percent of the land that is available. Those are like finger clippings that we are talking about.

Fact number three: The locals who live on this land, who know the land and who love the land, are almost in unanimous support of this proposition.

Fact number four: When we created the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge and this 10/02 section for oil exploration, we also made other decisions that increased our oil dependence on foreign sources, specifically from countries who do not like to play nice. What we have done by doing that is limit our diplomatic options. We have limited our independence. We have limited our freedom of action, and the only way to reverse that is to by creating clear oil independence, and that is an important step to do it.

So, for 11 times since 1995, we have passed in this body with a bipartisan vote of support drilling in this 10/02 section of land, and that was when the price of gas was cheap. We are now coming together for a 12th time with, once again, I hope bipartisan support to pass this effort. After all, it took Jacob 12 times to produce Joseph. I am convinced that we today on our 12th try will produce something as noble as that.

Now, there are some reasons for some people who do not want to do this. I consider it somewhat of an attitude issue. Sometimes we oversimplify our life. We think of the world as either black and white, yes or no, right or wrong, left or right, and do not recognize the shades of differences that are in between.

What our constituents want us to do is to reach across the aisle and in a bipartisan way try and solve an energy problem, understanding there are

shades. There is not one right or wrong answer, and understanding also there is no silver bullet to solve our energy needs. Jed Clampett will not go out there, shooting at some food, and up through the ground will come a bubbling crude.

We need conservation efforts. It is good. It should be encouraged, but that alone will not solve our problems. We need alternate energy sources. It is good. It should be encouraged. That alone will not solve our problems. We need oil exploration in this country. It is good. It should be encouraged. That alone will not solve our problems. But if we do not do the oil exploration, there is no hope of ever satisfying our problems. It has to be part of the equation.

There are some people who will also oversimplify the fact of saying you cannot have energy exploration and environmental protection. That is another attitude situation there because indeed you can have both. We have produced the technology to accomplish that. What used to take 60 acres to produce can now be done in 6 acres.

The simple fact is God has given us the resources to solve our problem. He has also given us the intellect to come up with the technology to solve our problem. Now what we must do is move forward in both areas to solve our problem, rather than sitting back and cursing the darkness.

When I first came here, there was a concerted effort to send e-mails to legislators, congressmen, in an effort to try and say not to do any kind of drilling up in this area set aside for that drilling purposes. I am perhaps different than my predecessor because I called those form e-mails back, and I just talked to many of them, realizing many of them had absolutely no clue about this area or what it was doing.

I remember specifically talking to a woman in Centerville, and in the course of the conversation saying that the people who live in this area and know it and who love this land are almost unanimously in favor of it, and her response was simply: Of course, they are. They do not know what is best for them.

It is that elitist, paternalistic attitude that has frustrated our efforts to solve this particular problem. It is now time for us to learn from our mistakes in the past and move forward and at long last do it with this particular legislation.

With that, Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of this rule. I urge adoption of the underlying legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), my good friend, for yielding me the time.

You know, it is not often that I find myself quoting the distinguished President Ronald Reagan, but this morning, I just cannot help myself. I feel like I

must say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, "well, there you go again."

It was just 1 week ago today that Mr. BISHOP and I were discussing the merits of drilling for oil and natural gas on the beaches of Florida or California and elsewhere. Thoughtfully, the House rejected that shortsighted and ill-conceived plan and left my Republican colleagues looking elsewhere on the map to score political points while doing absolutely nothing to help consumers or develop sound energy policy.

Of course, should ill-conceived ideas and shortsighted plans ever start selling for \$75 a barrel, I would like the drilling rights to the Republican party platform.

Madam Speaker, there are so many things wrong with this bill, it is almost like I do not know where to start. So much to criticize, so little time. For starters, let us take a look at how this bill might benefit our country, using the most wildly optimistic predictions of how much extractable oil there is in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Using the Bush administration's own estimates, which are probably inflated like some of the other Bush predictions we have heard over the past 5 years, there are 10.4 billion barrels of recoverable oil in ANWR. If this is accurate, then in 20 years, our reliance on foreign oil would be reduced from, get this, Madam Speaker, reduced from 60 percent to 57 percent and would likely result in gas prices being reduced by, again, using administration estimates, one penny per gallon. Well, on behalf of the American people, let me just say thank you for the relief at the pump in the year 2025.

Using less optimistic predictions, being more conservative if you will, there may be only 3.2 billion barrels of recoverable oil in ANWR or roughly 6 months of oil based on our current consumption. This is the silver bullet to our Nation's energy concerns?

Once again, like with the immigration issue, this administration and this Congress seem to only be moved to action when an issue becomes a political crisis. Both of these issues obviously have been a public policy crisis for years, but it is election year, isn't it? Some pay more attention to the needs of the American people when their jobs are on the line in 5 months from now.

You know what I find most interesting, Madam Speaker? It is the tepid support by energy companies for this proposal. Most of the major oil companies have recently pulled up stakes in Alaska. They have already come to the conclusion that this Congress will probably come to, I would think, in maybe 5 years and another 24 votes. It just does not make economic sense to drill in Alaska. BP, Amoco, Texaco and Chevron, among others, are examples of companies that are questioning their former commitment to drilling in the ANWR.

Here is one of my favorites, Madam Speaker, and I would advise my col-

leagues on the other side to pay attention because I am about to mention one of the most hallowed names from your point of view.

A former petroleum engineer from Halliburton, a company that heretofore has not seen a patch of land they did not want to exploit, said recently, "The enthusiasm of government officials about ANWR exceeds that of industry because oil companies are driven by market forces, investing resources in direct proportion to the economic potential, and the evidence so far about ANWR is not promising."

But you know, Madam Speaker, I am not as naive as some of my colleagues may think. I know this bill is not as much about Alaska as it is about Florida and California's outer continental shelf. I said it last week, and I will repeat it again today, this bill is simply trying to get the nose under the tent and using that approach.

It has been widely reported, without much argument, that opening up ANWR to oil drilling is simply a political ploy to opening the door to areas that allegedly have more promise, which brings us right back to where we were last week until our colleagues ADAM PUTNAM, LOIS CAPPS and JIM DAVIS helped to straighten things out.

Finally, Madam Speaker, to add insult to injury, the Rules Committee Republicans have shut out the American people from offering thoughtful alternatives to their risky scheme in the ANWR. Despite having no legislative business on the House floor tomorrow, none, no legislative business tomorrow, yes, Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer, Congress is taking another Friday off. Despite this fact, the leadership brings this bill to the floor under a closed rule. That means no duly elected Member of this body, Republican, Democrat or Independent, will have the opportunity to amend this bill. You heard me right. If any of 300 million Americans had a different idea about what to do about this bill, their elected representative in this House of Representatives is prohibited from offering an alternative, a change, a better plan. And we call this democracy?

Madam Speaker, for the reasons I have already articulated and for so many others that I am sure many of my colleagues will point out, we are prescribed by time constraints and, therefore, cannot discuss them all, but I urge any Member of this House who has any other idea about sound energy policy to oppose this closed rule and the underlying bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I would just in deference to the Rules Committee defending their actions note that there was only one amendment that was sent as a potential amendment to this rule, and that was nongermane. It is very difficult to put amendments in order that have never been submitted to the Rules Committee in the first place.

Madam Speaker, with that, maybe even to verify that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding and thank him for his fine leadership on this issue.

As Mr. POMBO pointed out when he became before the Rules Committee, we are people now embarking on the 12th vote on this issue, and it is our hope that the other body will, in recognition of the strong broad public support for our exploration in ANWR, will now be able to see us proceed with that.

I was thinking about the technological advances that we have made in this country. We have instant messaging. We have this amazing story I saw the other day of a Boeing aircraft that, rather than using 1,500 sheets of aluminum, they now are using one tiny piece of carbon fiber instead. We are seeing surgery being performed by robots successfully, and there is this sense somehow that when it comes to exploration in ANWR that it is sort of as if, you know, people believe that it is like we would have a blindfolded doctor drawing blood from a patient, like we have not made any advances whatsoever in the area of technology when, in fact, the energy industry has been in the forefront of technological advances.

So what we are talking about here, Madam Speaker, is using 21st century technology, and as Mr. POMBO said yesterday in the Rules Committee, extraordinarily rigorous, extraordinarily rigorous environmental standards, higher than ever, to explore this tiny little area to see if we might be able to create an opportunity to bring gasoline prices down to the American consumer.

□ 1115

It is, to me, a no-brainer. It is a no-brainer because we are doing everything we can to pursue alternative sources of energy. We are doing everything we can to make sure that we conserve. We are taking all of these steps; now let's take this tiny little spot about the size of Dulles International Airport, let's take that tiny spot and explore and simply see if there might be the potential for us to move closer towards domestic energy self-sufficiency.

This is a very clear vote. It is the right vote for us to cast. We need to support this rule. As Mr. BISHOP said, there was one amendment that was filed, and people understand the issue since we have debated it time and time again.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and to support the underlying legislation so that we can move towards energy self-sufficiency.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5429. In the Bible, in the Book of Genesis, Esau, believing he was about to die, sold his birthright to Jacob for a pot of red stew. The Alaskan National Wildlife Refuge is the birthright of the Gwich'in Tribe, who came to my office to indicate their opposition to this bill.

It is a national treasure of natural beauty and the natural habitat of the Porcupine Caribou. Are we, like Esau, about to sell our birthright for a mess of oily pottage? Are we ready to despoil our natural heritage in search of liquid fool's gold?

It is time for new thinking. Instead of oil companies taking over ANWR for drilling, we ought to be taking over the oil companies. They have gouged the American people at the pump. They control our politics. They have ignored the inconvenient truth of a growing global environmental crisis. After all, why are we having more hurricanes? We have to start thinking holistically and make the connections between cause and effect. We are not doing that when we talk about drilling here.

Oil companies work to defeat alternative energy. The lust for oil puts us on a path towards war. It is time for new energy policies, where we work for wind, solar, geothermal, and green hydrogen solutions. We should be enacting a windfall profits tax to address the gouging at the pump. We should be breaking up the oil monopolies and taking over the oil companies, if necessary.

We shouldn't be sacrificing ANWR. Esau thought his birthright didn't mean much. Will we, like Esau, come to regret that we never claimed our right to control our own natural resources, or our own environment, our own country?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to recognize for the purpose of talking about, once again, this area set aside by the Carter administration for future oil exploration, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) for 2½ minutes.

Mr. OSBORNE. Madam Speaker, I support H.R. 5429 and the underlying rule. Energy and exploration and production in ANWR will take place under the most stringent environmental protection requirements ever applied. It will be limited to just 2,000 acres of ANWR's 1002 area, which equals one ten-thousandths of the ANWR area, the size of a mid-sized U.S. airport.

The average estimate of recoverable oil from 2,000 acres of ANWR is 10.4 billion barrels. That is more than double the proven reserves of Texas and could increase America's total proven reserves, which is 21 billion barrels, by nearly 50 percent. Energy development on ANWR's northern coastal plain could deliver an additional 1.5 million barrels of oil per day, nearly equal to the amount we import from Saudi Arabia on a daily basis.

Experts have estimated that safe energy exploration and production in

ANWR would create between 250,000 and 1 million new jobs in the United States. Energy exploration and production in ANWR's northern coastal plain would raise \$111 billion to \$173 billion in Federal royalties and tax revenues. And given our current tax situation, we think that would certainly be somewhat notable.

H.R. 5429 includes an export ban. All oil and natural gas produced on ANWR's northern coastal plain must stay in the United States. Safe energy exploration and production have continued for the last 3 decades in Prudhoe Bay, just 80 miles west of ANWR. The caribou herd at Prudhoe Bay has tripled since development began. This contradicts the argument that ANWR drilling will lead to the demise of the caribou herd there.

Lastly, at today's energy prices, just the mean estimate of ANWR's resources represents a \$728 billion economic decision. The Congress will either vote "yes" to invest \$728 billion in America's energy security, economic growth, and job creation; or vote "no" to send all of the above overseas.

We cannot afford to continue to do this. Our dependence on overseas oil is certainly the major cause of our trade deficit at the present time. So I urge support of H.R. 5429 and the underlying rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, I rise today to strongly oppose this rule, the attempt to open the Arctic Wildlife Refuge to industrial development.

We have just heard previous speakers on the other side of the aisle talk about safe development, high-tech, and how there is no risk in drilling in ANWR. Well, just this past March, we are reminded of the potential environmental consequences of drilling. In the Alaskan refuge area, we need to protect this pristine environment. Why? Just recently, an Alaskan pipeline leaked 200,000 gallons of crude oil, just this past March. This is the largest spill ever in the north slope, and it should be a timely caution to all of us against opening the Arctic refuge to drilling.

Because I have visited the Arctic refuge and seen its unique wilderness firsthand, such news as leaks in pipelines, dumping 200,000 gallons of crude oil onto the Alaskan soil, strengthens my resolve to protect this refuge and press for real solutions to our country's energy challenges. This rule would do nothing more than to continue our pattern of unchecked consumption. It is another attempt to sell Americans the false promise of easy answers to our energy policy.

With the booming economies of China and India squeezing the global oil supply, and the political instability among key oil producing countries

such as Iran, Nigeria, and Iraq, we should be expecting rising oil prices for some time to come. Our energy situation will not change until this Republican-led Congress gets serious about attacking America's oil dependency.

The proposal to open ANWR is a shortsighted answer to a long-term problem, and I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule and the bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

Mr. GIBBONS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I rise today in full support of the underlying legislation and the rule. And I want to say, after listening to the last speaker, it reminds me that there are far too many lawyers in this body and not enough scientists, because oftentimes we hear emotion trumping science.

As the chairman of the Resources Committee Energy and Mineral Resource Subcommittee, I and the committee itself have been adamantly championing the use of renewable resources as well as increasing the production of our own abundant domestic resources.

For far too long, Madam Speaker, our Nation's energy supplies have been influenced by this false choice, a false choice between environmental protection and energy production. With the advancements in technology, we can strike a delicate balance between the two, not because it sounds politically right, but because it is the right policy.

For too long, development and production of our domestic energy has languished, driving investments overseas and increasing our reliance on foreign and often unstable energy resources. Yet we continue the cycle of tolerating irresponsible energy policies that discourage investment in domestic energy production. Relying on foreign and sometimes hostile nations for energy and minerals jeopardizes our national security and leaves American consumers at the mercy of the world energy markets.

For the safety and security of our homeland, I want the United States to be reasonably self-sufficient in meeting the demands of our current energy consumption. One important component of securing our future domestic energy supply is the environmentally responsible development of the 1002 lands in the Alaskan National Wildlife Refuge that was set aside specifically for oil exploration. This area was set aside in the mid 1960s when oil was less than \$5 a barrel, gasoline was less than 25 cents a gallon, because even at that time demand was increasing.

There was recognition then, Madam Speaker, that the need to increase supply was paramount. Today, we are nearing a critical mass in that need. Not only will we be competing with emerging economies like China and India for energy resources in the future, but our own domestic resources that are vital to securing our homeland

are left untapped as a result of demagoguery from those who refuse to address the realities of our current and future demand for energy resources.

It is disingenuous to say that ANWR will not provide a significant or important source of oil for our Nation. The USGS has estimated that the oil reserve in this area can replace the oil we get from Saudi Arabia for 30 years, 10.4 billion barrels, which would make the largest oil reserve find in the world since the nearby Prudhoe Bay discovery was done 30 years ago. We cannot wait another day to start securing our energy future.

The responsible development of this minuscule portion of ANWR that was always meant for oil exploration is a good start, and I urge all of my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 19½ minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Before yielding to my distinguished friend, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a March 20th report in The New York Times, byline reading "North Slope Oil Spill Raises New Concerns Over Pipeline Maintenance;" and equally from yesterday's Wall Street Journal, the "EPA and the FBI Check Allegations of Improper Repair Work on Two Big Storage Tanks."

For all my colleagues that talk about all this environmental protection, I would like for them to read these two articles.

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

There was no objection.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 20, 2006]

NORTH SLOPE OIL SPILL RAISES NEW CONCERNS OVER PIPELINE MAINTENANCE

(By Felicity Barringer)

WASHINGTON, Mar. 18.—An oil spill this month in Alaska, the largest ever on the North Slope, has raised new concerns among state and federal regulators about whether BP has been properly maintaining its aging network of wells, pumps and pipelines that crisscross the tundra.

BP Exploration Alaska, the subsidiary of the international oil giant that operates the corroded transmission line from which more than 200,000 gallons of crude oil leaked, has been criticized and fined in several different cases, most recently in 2004 when state regulators fined the company more than \$1.2 million.

Now the division of the federal Department of Transportation responsible for pipeline safety is looking into the company's maintenance practices.

James Wiggins, a spokesman for the office, said Friday that BP had been informed that it could not restart the pipeline until the company had thoroughly inspected the line, internally and externally, repaired it, and given the agency a corrosion monitoring plan.

In addition, one of the company's longtime employees, a mechanic and local union official who has participated in the spill clean-up, said in a telephone interview that he and his colleagues had repeatedly warned their superiors that cutbacks in routine maintenance

and inspection had increased the chances of accidents or spills.

In the interview, Marc Kovac, who is an official of the United Steelworkers union, which represents workers at the BP facility, said he had seen little change in BP's approach despite the warnings.

"For years we've been warning the company about cutting back on maintenance," Mr. Kovac said, adding that he was speaking for himself, not the union. "We know that this could have been prevented."

Asked about Mr. Kovac's account, Daren Beaudo, a company spokesman, said in an e-mail message, "Whenever employees raise concerns about our operations we look into them and address them." He did not specifically address Mr. Kovac's account of his complaints to his bosses.

In November 2004, the Alaska Oil and Gas Conservation Commission fined the company more than \$1.2 million after an explosion and fire at one of its wells. The accident, in 2002, left an operator badly burned.

BP has cultivated a worldwide image as a company concerned about the environment, recognizing global warming and making conspicuous efforts at aggressive environmental protection in many places.

But the most recent spill, which spurted from an elevated transmission pipeline at a spot where it dips to ground level to allow caribou to cross, has prompted critics inside the industry and among environmental groups to revisit questions raised four years ago. They question whether the company is skimping on maintenance and inspections to save money—a complaint the company strenuously denies.

But it remains unclear whether the company had warning that corrosion in this line had worsened to the point of a breach, and whether the warning signals company officials say they picked up in September should have prompted them to shut down this section of pipe and route oil around it.

"When we inspected the line in September 2005, points of manageable corrosion were evident and all were within standards of operations integrity," Mr. Beaudo said in an e-mail message. "Something happened to the corrosion rates in that line between September 2005 and the time of the spill that we don't yet fully understand."

Gary Evans, an environmental program specialist with the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation, defended the company in a telephone interview. Referring to the September inspections with ultrasound imaging, he said, "I believe in my heart if they would have found a spot on that pipeline that set off a bell or a whistle they would have shut it off" and built the kind of detour pipeline now under construction.

"I can't believe for a second that they would chance it," he added. "This is a worst-case scenario."

Another question is whether the company postponed for too long a rigorous but disruptive internal inspection of the pipeline, known in industry jargon as smart pigging.

In the procedure, electronic monitors called smart pigs—successors to an earlier generation of cleaning devices that squealed as they ran through the pipe—are used to measure the thickness of a pipe's walls and detect defects. Mr. Beaudo and Mr. Kovac agreed that since 1998 no such inspection had been performed on the line that leaked.

Setting up the device is cumbersome, and its data are hard to analyze. The process also slows the movement of oil to the Trans-Alaska Pipeline.

BP's own 2003 plan for safe maintenance and management of its facilities, on file with the Alaska Department of Environmental Protection, says that "the interval between smart-pig runs is typically five years."

Mr. Beaudou, the BP spokesman, said that since 1999, 85 external corrosion inspections had been conducted on that line. Further, he said, 139 internal inspections were performed with ultrasound devices, applied to the outside of the insulated pipe, providing a picture of the inside.

In a news conference on Tuesday, Maureen Johnson, the senior vice president and manager of the Greater Prudhoe Bay unit of BP Exploration Alaska, said, "We believe the leak was caused by internal corrosion and internal corrosion caused relatively, recently"—in the last six to nine months.

In September, she said, inspections revealed advancing corrosion and showed "we needed to do something." She said an internal "smart pig" inspection was scheduled for this month.

In an e-mail message to a company lawyer in June 2004, Mr. Kovac, the union official, assembled a collection of his earlier complaints to management. One of these, dated Feb. 28, 2003, concerned "corrosion monitoring staffing levels." It began, "The corrosion monitoring crew will soon be reduced to six staff down from eight."

Later, it noted, "With the present, staff, the crew is currently one month behind. The backlog is expected to increase with a further reduction in manpower."

Mr. Kovac and other workers have reported their concerns for several years to Chuck Hamel, a onetime oil broker who has made himself a conduit for getting press attention for worker complaints and whom Mr. Kovac called "our ombudsman."

Asked about Mr. Kovac's account, Mr. Hamel said: "Whatever I've been able to help the technicians publicize, they've fixed. Whatever we're not publicizing, we don't fix. They delay, and they schedule for next year. Everything's scheduled for next year. That way, if something goes, like in this case, they say, 'We scheduled that.'"

Mr. Beaudou, asked about staffing levels, said by e-mail, "We've significantly increased the number of external inspections since 2000," adding "and therefore have increased our staffing."

He pointed to the company's 2004 report to the state on corrosion monitoring. It shows that external and internal inspections on lines from the wellheads—usually smaller than the transmission lines like the one that leaked—rose from 39,001 in 2001 to 69,666 in 2002, before falling back slightly, to 60,666 in 2003 and 62,637 in 2004.

In a separate message he noted that staffing and scheduling decisions for the BP division that handles corrosion inspections "are carefully considered and managed according to the scope of the work being done."

In a news release Friday, Kurt Fredriksson, a commissioner of the state Department of Environmental Conservation, praised BP's efforts. "The oil spill response has been well managed," he said. "The spill occurred at a time when impacts to the environment are minimal."

The release also quoted him as saying, "We will be considering the investigation team's findings over the next several weeks in deciding whether to propose additional corrective actions or regulatory changes for leak detection, corrosion control and integrity management."

The line that leaked was in the last leg of a network that carries oil from the wellhead through processing facilities and on to the main pipeline that ends in Valdez.

The smaller lines nearer the wells are regulated by the state; lines like the 34-inch one that leaked are under the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration of the federal Transportation Department.

But that office exempts from its regulations pipelines, like the one that leaked,

that are in rural areas and are run at low pressures. At a House subcommittee hearing on Thursday, Lois N. Epstein, a petroleum engineer and an environmental advocate in Alaska; called for the department to scrap that exemption.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 24, 2006]
U.S. PROBES ALASKA PIPELINE REPAIRS: EPA, FBI CHECK ALLEGATIONS OF IMPROPER REPAIR WORK ON TWO BIG STORAGE TANKS

(By Jim Carlton)

Federal investigators are looking into allegations that workers contracted by oil companies that manage the Trans-Alaska Pipeline improperly repaired two giant storage tanks used by the pipeline, potentially putting the structures at risk, according to an agency charged with overseeing the 800-mile line.

Federal officials—including criminal investigators from the Environmental Protection Agency and the Federal Bureau of Investigation—are also looking into whether company and government officials in charge of overseeing the facility falsified records to make it appear the welding was done correctly, according to a former analyst for the consortium of oil companies that run the pipeline.

The inquiries come amid increased scrutiny of energy-infrastructure issues in Alaska and their consequences for both energy reliability and the environment. A separate informal criminal probe by the EPA began earlier this year over BP PLC's management of pipelines at the Prudhoe Bay field on Alaska's North Slope.

The pipeline is run by Alyeska Pipeline Service Co., a consortium that includes BP, Exxon Mobil Corp. and ConocoPhillips, and is overseen by the Joint Pipeline Office, a state-federal agency that also oversees the two tanks, which are near Valdez, Alaska.

Each tank can hold 500,000 barrels of oil. Critics say a breach could dump oil into nearby Prince William Sound and disrupt oil shipments to the continental U.S. Alyeska officials say the tanks sit behind dikes that would contain a spill.

An EPA spokesman declined to comment. FBI officials declined to confirm or deny an investigation was under way. JPO spokeswoman Rhea DoBosh said an employee of her agency was questioned by investigators of both federal agencies.

Ms. DoBosh added that her agency isn't aware of any wrongdoing and that it previously looked into complaints of faulty welds made during repair work on the tanks but failed to substantiate them. She also said she was unaware of an inquiry into alleged falsification of records.

Officials of Alyeska said they weren't aware of the federal inquiry and that they, too, had looked into the matter after complaints about the welds surfaced several years ago but found no problems.

The welding allegations originated with an employee of the joint-pipeline office, according to Glen Plumlee, who recently retired as a strategic planning coordinator at Alyeska. In an interview this week Mr. Plumlee said that shortly before he retired in April he was contacted by the employee about the allegations. Neither Mr. Plumlee nor the joint-pipeline office disclosed the identity of the employee.

Mr. Plumlee said that after retiring he notified the EPA and FBI about the allegations, which he said stemmed from welding done in 2001 and 2002.

Mr. Plumlee this month also sent a letter outlining the allegations to Charles Hamel, who has long served as a conduit for safety-related complaints by Alaskan oil-industry workers.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good

friend, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Today, we are engaged in a bait-and-switch exercise that Congress is exceptionally good at, but which is utterly shameful. We all know we have a problem, a broad problem. Ninety-eight percent of the fuel that is used by our vehicles, our autos and trucks for personal and commercial purposes, for highway and air travel operates on oil. The world has the same problem.

We have a now problem. Our gasoline prices are hovering at \$3 a gallon, and that causes a serious problem for a lot of our commerce and a lot of our families. Yet, if we accept the solution offered today by this bill to explore and develop for oil on the coastal plain of ANWR, it will be 5 years, at least, and probably closer to 8 before the first barrel of oil flows from that effort. By then, we will be having \$6 a gallon gasoline and only 1 to 2 years worth of the oil that we need every single year for our transportation.

The broad permanent solution, solar cars, hydrogen cars, electric cars, and total replacement of gasoline by ethanol cars, is most likely a generation away. But the real bait and switch is that we have the technology already available to increase the efficiency by 50 percent within the same 5 to 8 years that we would need to develop the first barrel of oil out of ANWR, which would save as much oil every single year that is provided for only 1 or 2 years by what we have had estimated as the ANWR capacity.

ANWR is a small part of Alaska. It is a small part of the north slope area of Alaska. Ninety percent, more than that, of the coastal plain of the north coast is already open to oil and gas exploration and development. The coastal plain within ANWR is an exceptionally concentrated productive habitat for caribou and migratory birds.

□ 1130

It provides calving for hundreds of thousands of caribou and nesting for a multitude of species of birds. The habitat also then becomes habitat for predator species.

It would be a tragedy to disrupt this very critical natural habitat by the utterly destructive action sanctioned by this bill which will not reduce by a single penny the gasoline prices which are our now problem. I hope we will not adopt either the rule or the legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I am always sometimes amazed or reminded by our friends from the oil- or energy-consuming States that don't understand the size of those in the West.

It is true that ANWR is a small percentage of Alaska, but I would remind you that the wildlife refuge of ANWR is still the size of South Carolina. The 1002 land we are talking about, which is not ANWR, which was set aside for exploration, is the size of Delaware; and that is still significant in that process.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak in favor of the rule and the underlying legislation, H.R. 5429, the American-Made Energy and Good Jobs Act. This important legislation will reduce our dependence on foreign sources of energy, moderate gas prices for consumers and create high-paying jobs. This legislation will do all of that while also reducing our trade and budget deficits.

Opening up ANWR, according to the mean estimate, would make available 10.4 billion barrels of oil for domestic consumption. That is more than the proven reserves in all of Texas. The resulting economic activity will create as many as 250,000 new jobs. As an additional benefit, royalties and corporate taxes in the amount of \$111 billion would flow to the Federal Government over 30 years, a modest but real improvement in our Nation's budget picture.

Madam Speaker, opponents of this legislation are going to make two different arguments. They are going to say that passage of this legislation will not address all of our energy problems, and they are going to voice environmental concerns. I want to briefly say a word about each of these points.

On the first argument, it is true: Opening ANWR will not solve all of our Nation's energy problems. But in point of fact, there is no single solution for all of our energy problems. We should no more reject ANWR because it fails to solve all of our energy problems than we should reject investing in promising sources of energy that may be many years away from fruition.

Likewise, we should not reject efforts at conservation just because this too can only solve part of the problem instead of all of it. Simply put, we cannot afford to reject any measure that helps us reach the goal of energy independence.

Madam Speaker, on the second concern regarding the environment, much has been said. My own view is this: With this legislation, we are faced with the choice of whether we have more of our energy production done overseas or whether to have more of it done in the United States. This choice has real environmental consequences. We can have more oil production occur here where it is done under the most stringent environmental regulations in the world, using the most sophisticated technology, or we can have more oil production done overseas where, in many cases, far weaker environmental regulations prevail.

True environmentalists think globally, not nationally. On this basis, we should produce as much energy as possible in the well-regulated confines of our own country.

I would urge Members to support this important legislation that would pro-

vide our Nation with a secure new source of domestic energy for many years to come.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Here we are Memorial Day weekend. In addition to taking time to reflect on those who have made our country safe and made sacrifices, it is the beginning of the traditional summer driving season.

Families across America are going to pay \$50 to fill up, or more, and they are mad. So here we are for the 13th time in the United States House of Representatives voting to put politics and symbolism over geology and reality.

Now, even if the wildly optimistic estimates of government bureaucrats, not the industry, about the reserves which the Republicans keep quoting with certainty, and they are far from certain; even if that was all there, this would provide a decade from today about 5 cents relief at the pump.

But if they were willing to take on Big Oil, we could deliver 70 cents tomorrow at the pump. 75 percent of the oil is traded in a speculative way. There is no market. There is no free market in oil. If we regulated oil the same as other commodities, estimates are we could save 70 cents tomorrow per gallon. If we broke up the collusion among the oil companies who have colluded to close refineries to drive up the price—refinery profits are up 255 percent in one year—then we could save Americans another 35 cents at the pump.

So with a couple of actions here on the floor, we could save people a buck a gallon. They are saying, 10 years from today, maybe under wild estimates we might save you a nickel.

But they are not going to take on Big Oil because Big Oil is very generous at campaign time, and this is all about the elections. They want to pretend that they are doing something meaningful.

Now they want to say it is environmentally sound. How do we get to that conclusion? It is deemed. Does anyone know what "deeming" means? Congress ignores reality and says we are creating a new reality. The reality is I came to Congress in 1987. We held weeks of hearings on this so-called environmental analysis. It was laughable at the time when produced by Mr. Watt and the Reagan administration. It was rejected by the courts. This was rejected 20 years ago. They are deeming it sufficient today. They are talking about the most modern technology and analysis and highest environmental protections. Yes, those of James Watt and Ronald Reagan rejected by the courts as insufficient 20 years ago so they can jam through a symbolic bill before Memorial Day weekend to pretend like they really care about American families.

They care about the CEOs of those companies. The head of ExxonMobil, a

\$400 million retirement. Those are the people they care about. They don't care about the families who are having to curtail their vacations because they can't afford 50 bucks to fill up.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

I am dismayed to see the issue of drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge come to the floor again, especially under a rule that is narrowly limited. It limits our debate on what is such a volatile issue, and it has the power to turn our Nation far off track in our road to increasing the use of alternative fuels.

Drilling for oil in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is the easy way out. Heading off to one of our last bastions of wildlands to fuel what the President has called an "addiction to oil" is shameful. This Congress can do better. This Congress can be creative.

As a Californian, I am proud of my State. When we have a problem, we think, we research it, we dedicate the resources. We create and we solve our problems. In a year, when the public is laughing at this Congress for the few days that we are working here, we have a chance to prove to America that we will take on the issue of energy dependence by investing in wind and solar, biomass, hydrogen, efficient energy programs that will create U.S. jobs.

Instead of debating these real issues, we are wasting our time once again on this narrow focus of drilling in what is our one pristine national wildland that really deserves saving, not to scour it for oil that will do little to help America's goal of energy independence.

I hope that this Congress will vote against this rule and vote against drilling in ANWR.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this.

I thought it was appropriate for our friends from the Rules Committee to talk about Jed Clampett shooting his gun and drilling up oil that way because, truly, this is sort of a Beverly Hillbillies approach to energy policy. It is a comedy of errors, and my Republican friends are shooting themselves in the foot.

Their approach to solve our problem, putting as central oil exploration in the United States, produces no hope of satisfying our long-term energy problem. They focus on giving billions of dollars to oil companies for breaks that industry does not need. They are missing in action on serious conservation,

fuel efficiency and work on alternative energy.

But one of the silliest arguments I have heard is that in an area the size of Delaware, we are “only” talking about 2,000 acres. We are “only” talking, as my friend from California mentioned, about the size of the Dulles Airport.

That is like saying the Augusta National Golf Course which has 18 golf holes, 4¼ inches in diameter, is only really have a golf footprint of less than 2 square feet.

Well, it is not just the hole that you are drilling, just like it is not the hole at the golf course. You have got golf cart paths, clubhouses, thousands of people who use it, irrigation, tool sheds, tee boxes.

My friend from Wisconsin could talk about all of the impacts of a golf course. If you are going to open this up to active oil exploration, you are going to have roads and ancillary activities that are going to produce a vast network, a wildly much greater footprint that is going to have serious economic and environmental consequences.

Madam Speaker, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, even if you think it should be drilled, is absolutely the last place we should be looking for oil, not the next place.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I don't want to try and change any kind of factual data, especially from my good friends from the Pacific Northwest, but actually this is the 12th, not the 13th time we have voted on this issue.

And, unfortunately, the Dulles Airport is actually five times bigger than the area we are talking about drilling. That is 11,000 acres. This is only 2,000 acres.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman also from the Pacific Northwest from the State of Washington (Miss MCMORRIS).

Miss MCMORRIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 5429. America deserves and needs American energy, and this legislation is an important step in achieving that.

The American-Made Energy and Good Jobs Act would open, as we have heard, just 2,000 acres of nearly 20 million acres. If it were a football field, it would be equivalent to the size of a postage stamp. If it were the front page of the New York Times, it would be equivalent to the size of a lower case letter “a.” This leaves 99 percent of the land in its natural condition.

However, these 2,000 acres would recover 10.4 billion barrels, more than double the proven reserves of Texas, increasing America's total proven reserves by almost 50 percent.

This legislation is even more important in lessening our dependence on foreign oil and establishing a safe domestic supply that will entirely go to Americans. No longer should we rely on oil from countries that are not necessarily friendly or democratic. In fact, ANWR has the possibility of delivering

an amount of oil equal to the amount we import from Saudi Arabia. A strong domestic energy supply, both oil and renewable, is vital to our economic and national security.

Right now, we face the challenge of high oil demand. To meet that demand, we need to establish a supply to meet it. Energy is important to Americans. Fifty years ago, America was an exporter of oil. A lot has changed, and today, we import over 60 percent of our oil. Yet since the 1950s, little has been done to prepare for our country's current or future energy needs.

When it comes to energy, we need a U.S.-based system that relies on its own ingenuity and innovation. Just as we brought the best minds and innovative companies together to put a man on the moon, we need a national organized effort to explore ANWR in an environmentally safe manner. Twenty-first century technology and advanced engineering now exists that allow us to explore for oil and natural gas with minimal impact on the surrounding environment.

Our energy policy must include a broad mix of options: From clean coal and natural gas to nuclear energy and hydroelectric power, to wind power and solar power to biodiesel. Drilling in ANWR is just one component of this comprehensive strategy.

□ 1145

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am privileged to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, we will hear a lot of discussion today about how drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge for our oil needs is nothing but an illusion, a fraud being perpetrated on the American people, because it is not going to be an answer either in the short term or the long term in regards to the energy challenge that we face. I believe that.

Why drilling in one of the most pristine, untouched areas of the world is something up for consideration in the House for the 12th time is beyond me.

But I also want to raise a very important issue, because there are a lot of gimmicks being played with the budget on this issue. At the very least, you think we would be honest and truthful and decent with the American taxpayer in regard to the hopeful revenues that this will generate.

In this legislation, it calls for a 50/50 split with the State of Alaska on royalties, but we all know this is not going to happen. The State legislature in Alaska last year passed a resolution saying, no, it will only agree to a 90/10 split. If we don't get it, we are suing you. Given the States' rights make-up in the court, they will in all likelihood prevail. Tens of billions of dollars are on the table over this important difference.

Even our friend and colleague in Alaska has publicly made it known his intent to fight this 50/50 split that is

contained in this legislation. Yet they will roll out the statistics on the budget revenue enhancers with royalties that we are going to be collecting by drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge when they know it is false.

So at the very least, we should at least pin down the State of Alaska and our colleague from Alaska into whether they are going to accept the 50/50 split or whether they will tie this up in courts and probably have the courts rule against us under the Alaska Statehood Act. That is something that should be clarified before the ink is dry on this legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise in full support of the rule and the underlying legislation, H.R. 5429, the American-Made Energy and Good Jobs Act.

Madam Speaker, I could stand up here and talk about a lot of facts and figures that are astounding, I think, and will help the United States of America. But the bottom line is, we need to be more dependent on ourselves and not somebody else.

National security and national interest begin right here at home. Granted, some day I think we will solve this energy crisis. We will have a wonderful solution, but right now, we need to be more self-reliant and independent.

Keeping this country both safe and strong is a pledge that I made and a pledge that I will keep. I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and the underlying legislation to keep our Nation safe.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR).

Mr. SALAZAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the rule and to H.R. 5429. This is legislation that would open up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil and gas exploration. I find it unbelievable that such a bad and ineffective bill could be given such a good name.

Opening up ANWR to drilling is not the answer to America's energy problem. It certainly will not create the jobs needed to help my hometown of Manassa, Colorado. What opening up ANWR will do is destroy one of the most pristine environments on our entire continent. Nobody really knows for sure how much oil there is in ANWR. Unfortunately, it would require a significant amount of drilling and testing to find this out.

Once they start exploration, they will already have destroyed part of the environment, an environment where I understand that no plant or animal species has gone extinct or that no outside species has invaded. It is pristine. In our global society, it has become apparent that we need to leave some areas untouched. ANWR is one of those areas.

I realize that our country has a fundamental imbalance between supply

and demand. Drilling in ANWR will provide little, if any, relief on demand. We cannot drill our way out of these problems.

Likewise, we cannot conserve our way out of the energy problems. We must diversify our portfolio.

On my farm, I do not grow just one crop. I must diversify my farming operation to be able to handle the ups and downs of the agricultural markets, and that is exactly what we need to do in this country.

By diversifying our energy portfolio, the country can better handle the volatility of energy markets. We need to invest in alternative energy resources, conservation and responsible domestic energy development. We have just a few unspoiled lands remaining in our country. We need to protect them.

Drilling in ANWR is not a form of responsible domestic energy development. I ask my colleagues to help protect ANWR. There is no better way in our country to reach energy independence than granting access to ANWR. This is a poor bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote against this legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 835, the rule for H.R. 5429, the American-Made Energy and Good Jobs Act. This legislation introduced by our own Chairman POMBO will provide for the responsible development of our domestic resources located on a very small portion of the nearly 20 million acre Alaskan National Wildlife Reserve. The size of the surface area that is proposed to be utilized is 2,000 acres.

To put that in perspective, when I fly out of Denver, Colorado from the airport there, DIA is situated on 34,000 acres. When the 20 million acre wildlife refuge was created by President Carter, a 1.5 million acre northern section was set aside for future energy exploration and development. Utilizing 2,000 acres is not an unreasonable amount to safely produce nearly 5 percent of our Nation's daily oil needs.

The people of Colorado are reasonable. They understand the need to find and produce domestic energy resources in a safe and sound manner. The small portion of ANWR that is proposed to be developed will produce approximately 1.5 million barrels of oil per day every day for 30 years. The level of production could replace imports from Saudi Arabia again for nearly 30 years. Relying on hostile governments for the fuel that runs our economy is dangerous, and it compromises our national security.

In order to meet our current and future energy demands, we must responsibly develop our abundant domestic resources in ANWR. I urge all of the Members to support House Resolution 835.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

MR. HERGER. Madam Speaker, my constituents in northern California are paying some of the highest gas prices in America. While prices continue to rise, ironically, the single-most promising untapped source of American oil in gas, ironically, remains off-limits to production.

This restriction does nothing to protect the environment. It simply ensures that Americans will continue to rely on foreign sources of oil. None of these foreign countries share our commitment to the environment, and many even have ties to terrorists. Madam Speaker, America has the most stringent environmental laws in the world, and we have the most advanced technology ever invented. This legislation combines our commitment to the environment with state-of-the-art technology to produce a commonsense plan for a secure energy future.

I urge support of the rule and for H.R. 5429.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have listened to this debate rather repeatedly over the years, and I still am trying to determine how it is that my colleagues on the other side persist in having politics triumph over geology.

I know of no substantial study that demonstrates that there would be a sufficient amount of oil that would cause substantial price decreases in gas at the pump. Given its wildest potential, even the most optimistic, it would be well into the future, probably as late as 2012 before a single drop of oil would go into a refinery and then a gas tank.

There is so much to be said for the fact that this Arctic reserve, in its pristine form, is among the last natural habitats that the United States has preserved. Unfortunately, in my State, every day that I pass on a road, I see more and more ecosystem destroyed so that we can build more and cause substantial damage to the environment.

Those of us who speak of environmental degradation do so with great passion, recognizing the significant need that we have as a country to produce alternative energy sources and to lessen our dependence on foreign oil. That is a real concern that I believe my colleagues and the majority and those of us in the minority share.

How you get there is not through a ruse, in the final analysis, and that is what ANWR is, because no one has been able, with the exception of one drilling action that took place in 1998 that has been a closely held secret, no one has been able to really tell any of us how much oil is there.

Given the best amount, it would be 10 billion barrels, which doesn't come close to what the problem is, and that is of the significant amount of coastal

oil that exists off the shore of California and Florida in the gulf, and that is over 70 billion barrels by scientific estimate.

So, basically, what my colleagues want to do and what the administration wants to do is stick its nose under the tent and drill in a pristine area and then lift the moratoria that exists in California and Florida for offshore drilling.

I don't know how long many of us have been in Congress or will be here, but I don't believe that it is wise policy for us to damage our environment for political gain and to do so in a political season, when, in fact, we know that what we do, even if this were to pass, and I call on my colleagues to defeat this rule, even if it were to pass, we know full well that it will not provide what is needed for us all.

I might add that the administration seems to be going in a different direction than many of the oil companies. Significant numbers of them, ConocoPhillips, for example, has stopped its financial support of Arctic power; Chevron, Texaco, BP, long active in Alaska, moved their executives to Houston from Alaska for the reason that they no longer feel that they are going to be able to produce the kinds of results that had been predicted. ExxonMobil has shown little public enthusiasm for the refuge.

I don't know if this enthusiasm that is coming from the other side is motivated by reality, but I do know this: It has a lot to do with politics and very little to do with geological realities. Let us defeat this rule and defeat this substantive measure for the 12th time and be prepared to do so the 13th, because I am sure my colleagues will bring it back.

□ 1200

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I would like to make just a couple of points in closing. One of the issues that was brought up at the last moment was on a potential court challenge based on a potential 90-10 demand by the State of Alaska rather than 50-50 in the bill. Such an issue is a question. However, on a separate piece of legislation in a separate court system, the Federal court has rejected the 90-10 argument, so even if there is anything, 50-50 will be the reality of it. That is the precedent that has already been established.

The gentleman from Colorado, who was speaking towards the end, talked about the need to diversify, diversify on his agricultural endeavors, diversify on what we are doing with our energy needs, and I agree totally.

As I said earlier, it is important, it is sufficient that there is not one sole silver bullet to solve our energy needs. We need conservation programs. We need alternative energy programs. We also need to drill the oil that is available in the United States to lessen our dependence on foreign oil. It is true that we cannot solve our energy problems if we do not do that other leg of the situation.

It is important that we can do this also in an environmentally sensitive way. Once again, don't take my word for it, but once again the Energy Department, during the Clinton administration, in their Report on Environmental Benefits of Advanced Oil and Gas Exploration and Production Technology, established an entire chapter to the fact that our technology has advanced to the time where we can do this production and maintain environmental sensitivity at the same time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. No, let me just finish. I apologize. Let me finish, if I may.

That was in 1999. In the year 2000, once again, the Argonne National Laboratory study dealing with an area just 80 miles from the proposed drilling site, once again, concluded there were no impacts on any wildlife species that have ever been documented in that particular area.

We are not dealing with the wildlife refuge, the so-called pristine area. That has already been set aside, as well as 100 million acres of other pristine area within Alaska and the Lower 48. But this ANWR, the wilderness refuge, is still the size of the State of South Carolina, which will not be impacted.

What we are talking about is potential drilling in the 1002 lands, the size of the State of Delaware, that was set aside by the minority party when they were in power back in the 1980s as an area for future exploration. That was its purpose. That was its goal.

We are asking that simply to fulfill the purpose of this particular land and do it in the proper way, and do it in a way that will be smaller than Dulles. Actually it is more like the size of Reagan Airport, which is far less encompassing than the Dulles Airport.

We can do this. We need to do this. We need to move this country forward.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, during consideration of H.R. 5429 pursuant to House Resolution 835, the Speaker may postpone further proceedings on a motion to recommit as though under clause 8(a)(1)(A) of rule XX.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Reserving the right to object, and I will not object, Madam Speaker, but I do want to point out to my colleague, in light of the fact that he did not yield to me and that is why I reserve the right to object, that the 90-10 royalty reality was in the form of an amendment that my colleagues chose not to make in order so that we could settle that issue. You point to it rightly as a very significant issue, and the 50-50 split would enhance the opportunities of the American public.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Finishing my time here, Madam Speaker, I appreciate the parliamentary procedures that my good friend from Florida knows and does extremely well here. It is true, that was part of the amendment deemed nongermane to the issue at hand. And, once again, I think the precedent is there that that problem is solved and is a moot issue.

With that, Madam Speaker, I would urge our support of this rule, I would urge our support for the 12th and final time of passing this needed piece of legislation as a significant part of our energy independence in this country.

Madam Speaker, I yield back my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 184, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 207]

YEAS—234

Aderholt	Culberson	Hefley
Akin	Davis (KY)	Hensarling
Alexander	Davis, Jo Ann	Herger
Bachus	Davis, Tom	Hobson
Baker	Deal (GA)	Hoekstra
Barrett (SC)	Dent	Hostettler
Bartlett (MD)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hulshof
Barton (TX)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hunter
Bass	Doolittle	Inglis (SC)
Beauprez	Drake	Issa
Biggert	Dreier	Istook
Bilirakis	Duncan	Jenkins
Bishop (UT)	Ehlers	Jindal
Blackburn	Emerson	Johnson (CT)
Blunt	English (PA)	Johnson (IL)
Boehert	Everett	Johnson, Sam
Boehner	Feeney	Jones (NC)
Bonilla	Ferguson	Kanjorski
Bonner	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Keller
Bono	Foley	Kelly
Boozman	Forbes	Kennedy (MN)
Boren	Fortenberry	King (IA)
Boustany	Fossella	King (NY)
Bradley (NH)	Fox	Kingston
Brown (SC)	Franks (AZ)	Kirk
Brown-Waite,	Frelinghuysen	Kline
Ginny	Gallely	Knollenberg
Burgess	Garrett (NJ)	Kolbe
Burton (IN)	Gerlach	Kuhl (NY)
Buyer	Gibbons	LaHood
Calvert	Gilchrist	Latham
Camp (MI)	Gillmor	LaTourette
Campbell (CA)	Gingrey	Leach
Cannon	Gohmert	Lewis (CA)
Cantor	Goode	Lewis (KY)
Capito	Goodlatte	Linder
Carter	Granger	LoBiondo
Castle	Graves	Lucas
Chabot	Green (WI)	Lungren, Daniel
Chocola	Green, Gene	E.
Coble	Gutknecht	Mack
Cole (OK)	Hall	Manzullo
Conaway	Harris	Marchant
Cramer	Hart	McCaul (TX)
Crenshaw	Hastings (WA)	McCotter
Cubin	Hayes	McCrery
Cuellar	Hayworth	McHenry

McHugh	Pombo	Simmons
McKeon	Porter	Simpson
McMorris	Price (GA)	Skelton
Melancon	Pryce (OH)	Smith (NJ)
Mica	Putnam	Smith (TX)
Miller (FL)	Radanovich	Sodrel
Miller (MI)	Ramstad	Souder
Miller, Gary	Regula	Stearns
Moran (KS)	Rehberg	Sullivan
Murphy	Reichert	Sweeney
Murtha	Renzi	Tancredo
Musgrave	Reyes	Taylor (NC)
Myrick	Reynolds	Terry
Neugebauer	Rogers (AL)	Thomas
Ney	Rogers (KY)	Thornberry
Northup	Rogers (MI)	Tiahrt
Norwood	Rohrabacher	Tiberi
Nunes	Ros-Lehtinen	Turner
Nussle	Royce	Upton
Ortiz	Ryan (WI)	Walden (OR)
Osborne	Ryun (KS)	Walsh
Otter	Saxton	Wamp
Oxley	Schmidt	Weldon (FL)
Paul	Schwarz (MI)	Weldon (PA)
Pearce	Sensenbrenner	Weller
Pence	Sessions	Whitfield
Peterson (PA)	Shadegg	Wicker
Petri	Shaw	Wilson (NM)
Pickering	Shays	Wolf
Pitts	Sherwood	Young (AK)
Platts	Shimkus	Young (FL)
Poe	Shuster	

NAYS—184

Abercrombie	Grijalva	Obey
Ackerman	Gutierrez	Olver
Allen	Harman	Owens
Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Baca	Hereth	Pascarell
Baird	Higgins	Pastor
Baldwin	Hinchee	Payne
Barrow	Hinojosa	Pelosi
Bean	Holden	Peterson (MN)
Becerra	Holt	Pomeroy
Berkley	Honda	Price (NC)
Berry	Hoolley	Rahall
Bishop (GA)	Hoyer	Rangel
Bishop (NY)	Inslee	Ross
Blumenauer	Israel	Rothman
Boswell	Jackson (IL)	Royal-Allard
Boucher	Jackson-Lee	Ruppersberger
Boyd	(TX)	Rush
Brady (PA)	Jefferson	Ryan (OH)
Brown (OH)	Johnson, E. B.	Sabo
Brown, Corrine	Jones (OH)	Salazar
Butterfield	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Capps	Kildee	T.
Capuano	Kilpatrick (MI)	Sanchez, Loretta
Cardin	Kind	Sanders
Cardoza	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Carnahan	Langevin	Schiff
Carson	Lantos	Schwartz (PA)
Case	Larsen (WA)	Scott (GA)
Chandler	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Clay	Lee	Serrano
Cleaver	Levin	Sherman
Clyburn	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Conyers	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Cooper	Loftgren, Zoe	Solis
Costello	Lowe	Spratt
Crowley	Lynch	Stark
Cummings	Maloney	Strickland
Davis (AL)	Markey	Stupak
Davis (CA)	Marshall	Tanner
Davis (FL)	Matheson	Tauscher
Davis (IL)	Matsui	Taylor (MS)
Davis (TN)	McCarthy	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	McCollum (MN)	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	McDermott	Tierney
Delahunt	McGovern	Towns
DeLauro	McIntyre	Udall (CO)
Dicks	McKinney	Udall (NM)
Dingell	McNulty	Van Hollen
Doggett	Meehan	Velázquez
Doyle	Meek (FL)	Visclosky
Edwards	Meeks (NY)	Wasserman
Emanuel	Michaud	Schultz
Engel	Millender-	Waters
E.	McDonald	Watson
Etheridge	Miller (NC)	Watt
Farr	Moore (KS)	Waxman
Fattah	Moore (WI)	Weiner
Filner	Moran (VA)	Wexler
Ford	Nadler	Woolsey
Gonzalez	Napolitano	Wu
Gordon	Neal (MA)	Wynne
Green, Al	Oberstar	

NOT VOTING—14

Berman	Flake	Mollohan
Brady (TX)	Frank (MA)	Snyder
Costa	Hyde	Westmoreland
DeLay	Kennedy (RI)	Wilson (SC)
Evans	Miller, George	

□ 1230

Ms. BEAN changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. REYES and Mr. CRAMER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 835, I call up the bill (H.R. 5429) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish and implement a competitive oil and gas leasing program that will result in an environmentally sound program for the exploration, development, and production of the oil and gas resources of the Coastal Plain of Alaska, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5429

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "American-Made Energy and Good Jobs Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **COASTAL PLAIN.**—The term "Coastal Plain" means that area described in appendix I to part 37 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations.

(2) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary", except as otherwise provided, means the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary's designee.

SEC. 3. LEASING PROGRAM FOR LANDS WITHIN THE COASTAL PLAIN.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall take such actions as are necessary—

(1) to establish and implement, in accordance with this Act and acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management in consultation with the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, a competitive oil and gas leasing program that will result in an environmentally sound program for the exploration, development, and production of the oil and gas resources of the Coastal Plain; and

(2) to administer the provisions of this Act through regulations, lease terms, conditions, restrictions, prohibitions, stipulations, and other provisions that ensure the oil and gas exploration, development, and production activities on the Coastal Plain will result in no significant adverse effect on fish and wildlife, their habitat, subsistence resources, and the environment, including, in furtherance of this goal, by requiring the application of the best commercially available technology for oil and gas exploration, development, and production to all exploration, development, and production operations under this Act in a manner that ensures the receipt of fair market value by the public for the mineral resources to be leased.

(b) **REPEAL.**—

(1) **REPEAL.**—Section 1003 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 3143) is repealed.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in section 1 of such Act is amended by striking the item relating to section 1003.

(c) COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS UNDER CERTAIN OTHER LAWS.—

(1) **COMPATIBILITY.**—For purposes of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd et seq.), the oil and gas leasing program and activities authorized by this section in the Coastal Plain are deemed to be compatible with the purposes for which the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge was established, and no further findings or decisions are required to implement this determination.

(2) **ADEQUACY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR'S LEGISLATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.**—The "Final Legislative Environmental Impact Statement" (April 1987) on the Coastal Plain prepared pursuant to section 1002 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 3142) and section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)) is deemed to satisfy the requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 that apply with respect to prelease activities, including actions authorized to be taken by the Secretary to develop and promulgate the regulations for the establishment of a leasing program authorized by this Act before the conduct of the first lease sale.

(3) **COMPLIANCE WITH NEPA FOR OTHER ACTIONS.**—Before conducting the first lease sale under this Act, the Secretary shall prepare an environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 with respect to the actions authorized by this Act that are not referred to in paragraph (2). Notwithstanding any other law, the Secretary is not required to identify non-leasing alternative courses of action or to analyze the environmental effects of such courses of action. The Secretary shall only identify a preferred action for such leasing and a single leasing alternative, and analyze the environmental effects and potential mitigation measures for those two alternatives. The identification of the preferred action and related analysis for the first lease sale under this Act shall be completed within 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act. The Secretary shall only consider public comments that specifically address the Secretary's preferred action and that are filed within 20 days after publication of an environmental analysis. Notwithstanding any other law, compliance with this paragraph is deemed to satisfy all requirements for the analysis and consideration of the environmental effects of proposed leasing under this Act.

(4) **RELATIONSHIP TO STATE AND LOCAL AUTHORITY.**—Nothing in this Act shall be considered to expand or limit State and local regulatory authority.

(e) **SPECIAL AREAS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, after consultation with the State of Alaska, the city of Kaktovik, and the North Slope Borough, may designate up to a total of 45,000 acres of the Coastal Plain as a Special Area if the Secretary determines that the Special Area is of such unique character and interest so as to require special management and regulatory protection. The Secretary shall designate as such a Special Area the Sadlerochit Spring area, comprising approximately 4,000 acres.

(2) **MANAGEMENT.**—Each such Special Area shall be managed so as to protect and preserve the area's unique and diverse character including its fish, wildlife, and subsistence resource values.

(3) **EXCLUSION FROM LEASING OR SURFACE OCCUPANCY.**—The Secretary may exclude any Special Area from leasing. If the Secretary

leases a Special Area, or any part thereof, for purposes of oil and gas exploration, development, production, and related activities, there shall be no surface occupancy of the lands comprising the Special Area.

(4) **DIRECTIONAL DRILLING.**—Notwithstanding the other provisions of this subsection, the Secretary may lease all or a portion of a Special Area under terms that permit the use of horizontal drilling technology from sites on leases located outside the Special Area.

(f) **LIMITATION ON CLOSED AREAS.**—The Secretary's sole authority to close lands within the Coastal Plain to oil and gas leasing and to exploration, development, and production is that set forth in this Act.

(g) **REGULATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this Act, including rules and regulations relating to protection of the fish and wildlife, their habitat, subsistence resources, and environment of the Coastal Plain, by no later than 15 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) **REVISION OF REGULATIONS.**—The Secretary shall periodically review and, if appropriate, revise the rules and regulations issued under subsection (a) to reflect any significant biological, environmental, or engineering data that come to the Secretary's attention.

SEC. 4. LEASE SALES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Lands may be leased pursuant to this Act to any person qualified to obtain a lease for deposits of oil and gas under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.).

(b) **PROCEDURES.**—The Secretary shall, by regulation, establish procedures for—

(1) receipt and consideration of sealed nominations for any area in the Coastal Plain for inclusion in, or exclusion (as provided in subsection (c)) from, a lease sale;

(2) the holding of lease sales after such nomination process; and

(3) public notice of and comment on designation of areas to be included in, or excluded from, a lease sale.

(c) **LEASE SALE BIDS.**—Bidding for leases under this Act shall be by sealed competitive cash bonus bids.

(d) **ACREAGE MINIMUM IN FIRST SALE.**—In the first lease sale under this Act, the Secretary shall offer for lease those tracts the Secretary considers to have the greatest potential for the discovery of hydrocarbons, taking into consideration nominations received pursuant to subsection (b)(1), but in no case less than 200,000 acres.

(e) **TIMING OF LEASE SALES.**—The Secretary shall—

(1) conduct the first lease sale under this Act within 22 months after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) conduct additional sales so long as sufficient interest in development exists to warrant, in the Secretary's judgment, the conduct of such sales.

SEC. 5. GRANT OF LEASES BY THE SECRETARY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may grant to the highest responsible qualified bidder in a lease sale conducted pursuant to section 4 any lands to be leased on the Coastal Plain upon payment by the lessee of such bonus as may be accepted by the Secretary.

(b) **SUBSEQUENT TRANSFERS.**—No lease issued under this Act may be sold, exchanged, assigned, sublet, or otherwise transferred except with the approval of the Secretary. Prior to any such approval the Secretary shall consult with, and give due consideration to the views of, the Attorney General.

SEC. 6. LEASE TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—An oil or gas lease issued pursuant to this Act shall—

(1) provide for the payment of a royalty of not less than 12½ percent in amount or value of the production removed or sold from the lease, as determined by the Secretary under the regulations applicable to other Federal oil and gas leases;

(2) provide that the Secretary may close, on a seasonal basis, portions of the Coastal Plain to exploratory drilling activities as necessary to protect caribou calving areas and other species of fish and wildlife;

(3) require that the lessee of lands within the Coastal Plain shall be fully responsible and liable for the reclamation of lands within the Coastal Plain and any other Federal lands that are adversely affected in connection with exploration, development, production, or transportation activities conducted under the lease and within the Coastal Plain by the lessee or by any of the subcontractors or agents of the lessee;

(4) provide that the lessee may not delegate or convey, by contract or otherwise, the reclamation responsibility and liability to another person without the express written approval of the Secretary;

(5) provide that the standard of reclamation for lands required to be reclaimed under this Act shall be, as nearly as practicable, a condition capable of supporting the uses which the lands were capable of supporting prior to any exploration, development, or production activities, or upon application by the lessee, to a higher or better use as approved by the Secretary;

(6) contain terms and conditions relating to protection of fish and wildlife, their habitat, subsistence resources, and the environment as required pursuant to section 3(a)(2);

(7) provide that the lessee, its agents, and its contractors use best efforts to provide a fair share, as determined by the level of obligation previously agreed to in the 1974 agreement implementing section 29 of the Federal Agreement and Grant of Right of Way for the Operation of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, of employment and contracting for Alaska Natives and Alaska Native Corporations from throughout the State;

(8) prohibit the export of oil produced under the lease; and

(9) contain such other provisions as the Secretary determines necessary to ensure compliance with the provisions of this Act and the regulations issued under this Act.

(b) **PROJECT LABOR AGREEMENTS.**—The Secretary, as a term and condition of each lease under this Act and in recognizing the Government's proprietary interest in labor stability and in the ability of construction labor and management to meet the particular needs and conditions of projects to be developed under the leases issued pursuant to this Act and the special concerns of the parties to such leases, shall require that the lessee and its agents and contractors negotiate to obtain a project labor agreement for the employment of laborers and mechanics on production, maintenance, and construction under the lease.

SEC. 7. COASTAL PLAIN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION.

(a) **NO SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE EFFECT STANDARD TO GOVERN AUTHORIZED COASTAL PLAIN ACTIVITIES.**—The Secretary shall, consistent with the requirements of section 3, administer the provisions of this Act through regulations, lease terms, conditions, restrictions, prohibitions, stipulations, and other provisions that—

(1) ensure the oil and gas exploration, development, and production activities on the Coastal Plain will result in no significant adverse effect on fish and wildlife, their habitat, and the environment;

(2) require the application of the best commercially available technology for oil and gas exploration, development, and produc-

tion on all new exploration, development, and production operations; and

(3) ensure that the maximum amount of surface acreage covered by production and support facilities, including airstrips and any areas covered by gravel berms or piers for support of pipelines, does not exceed 2,000 acres on the Coastal Plain.

(b) **SITE-SPECIFIC ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATION.**—The Secretary shall also require, with respect to any proposed drilling and related activities, that—

(1) a site-specific analysis be made of the probable effects, if any, that the drilling or related activities will have on fish and wildlife, their habitat, subsistence resources, and the environment;

(2) a plan be implemented to avoid, minimize, and mitigate (in that order and to the extent practicable) any significant adverse effect identified under paragraph (1); and

(3) the development of the plan shall occur after consultation with the agency or agencies having jurisdiction over matters mitigated by the plan.

(c) **REGULATIONS TO PROTECT COASTAL PLAIN FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES, SUBSISTENCE USERS, AND THE ENVIRONMENT.**—Before implementing the leasing program authorized by this Act, the Secretary shall prepare and promulgate regulations, lease terms, conditions, restrictions, prohibitions, stipulations, and other measures designed to ensure that the activities undertaken on the Coastal Plain under this Act are conducted in a manner consistent with the purposes and environmental requirements of this Act.

(d) **COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL AND STATE ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS.**—The proposed regulations, lease terms, conditions, restrictions, prohibitions, and stipulations for the leasing program under this Act shall require compliance with all applicable provisions of Federal and State environmental law, and shall also require the following:

(1) Standards at least as effective as the safety and environmental mitigation measures set forth in items 1 through 29 at pages 167 through 169 of the "Final Legislative Environmental Impact Statement" (April 1987) on the Coastal Plain.

(2) Seasonal limitations on exploration, development, and related activities, where necessary, to avoid significant adverse effects during periods of concentrated fish and wildlife breeding, denning, nesting, spawning, and migration.

(3) That exploration activities, except for surface geological studies, be limited to the period between approximately November 1 and May 1 each year and that exploration activities shall be supported, if necessary, by ice roads, winter trails with adequate snow cover, ice pads, ice airstrips, and air transport methods, except that such exploration activities may occur at other times if the Secretary finds that such exploration will have no significant adverse effect on the fish and wildlife, their habitat, and the environment of the Coastal Plain.

(4) Design safety and construction standards for all pipelines and any access and service roads, that—

(A) minimize, to the maximum extent possible, adverse effects upon the passage of migratory species such as caribou; and

(B) minimize adverse effects upon the flow of surface water by requiring the use of culverts, bridges, and other structural devices.

(5) Prohibitions on general public access and use on all pipeline access and service roads.

(6) Stringent reclamation and rehabilitation requirements, consistent with the standards set forth in this Act, requiring the removal from the Coastal Plain of all oil and gas development and production facilities,

structures, and equipment upon completion of oil and gas production operations, except that the Secretary may exempt from the requirements of this paragraph those facilities, structures, or equipment that the Secretary determines would assist in the management of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and that are donated to the United States for that purpose.

(7) Appropriate prohibitions or restrictions on access by all modes of transportation.

(8) Appropriate prohibitions or restrictions on sand and gravel extraction.

(9) Consolidation of facility siting.

(10) Appropriate prohibitions or restrictions on use of explosives.

(11) Avoidance, to the extent practicable, of springs, streams, and river system; the protection of natural surface drainage patterns, wetlands, and riparian habitats; and the regulation of methods or techniques for developing or transporting adequate supplies of water for exploratory drilling.

(12) Avoidance or minimization of air traffic-related disturbance to fish and wildlife.

(13) Treatment and disposal of hazardous and toxic wastes, solid wastes, reserve pit fluids, drilling muds and cuttings, and domestic wastewater, including an annual waste management report, a hazardous materials tracking system, and a prohibition on chlorinated solvents, in accordance with applicable Federal and State environmental law.

(14) Fuel storage and oil spill contingency planning.

(15) Research, monitoring, and reporting requirements.

(16) Field crew environmental briefings.

(17) Avoidance of significant adverse effects upon subsistence hunting, fishing, and trapping by subsistence users.

(18) Compliance with applicable air and water quality standards.

(19) Appropriate seasonal and safety zone designations around well sites, within which subsistence hunting and trapping shall be limited.

(20) Reasonable stipulations for protection of cultural and archeological resources.

(21) All other protective environmental stipulations, restrictions, terms, and conditions deemed necessary by the Secretary.

(e) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In preparing and promulgating regulations, lease terms, conditions, restrictions, prohibitions, and stipulations under this section, the Secretary shall consider the following:

(1) The stipulations and conditions that govern the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska leasing program, as set forth in the 1999 Northeast National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska Final Integrated Activity Plan/Environmental Impact Statement.

(2) The environmental protection standards that governed the initial Coastal Plain seismic exploration program under parts 37.31 to 37.33 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) The land use stipulations for exploratory drilling on the KIC-ASRC private lands that are set forth in Appendix 2 of the August 9, 1983, agreement between Arctic Slope Regional Corporation and the United States.

(f) **FACILITY CONSOLIDATION PLANNING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall, after providing for public notice and comment, prepare and update periodically a plan to govern, guide, and direct the siting and construction of facilities for the exploration, development, production, and transportation of Coastal Plain oil and gas resources.

(2) **OBJECTIVES.**—The plan shall have the following objectives:

(A) Avoiding unnecessary duplication of facilities and activities.

(B) Encouraging consolidation of common facilities and activities.

(C) Locating or confining facilities and activities to areas that will minimize impact on fish and wildlife, their habitat, and the environment.

(D) Utilizing existing facilities wherever practicable.

(E) Enhancing compatibility between wildlife values and development activities.

(g) ACCESS TO PUBLIC LANDS.—The Secretary shall—

(1) manage public lands in the Coastal Plain subject to subsections (a) and (b) of section 811 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3121); and

(2) ensure that local residents shall have reasonable access to public lands in the Coastal Plain for traditional uses.

SEC. 8. EXPEDITED JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) FILING OF COMPLAINT.—

(1) DEADLINE.—Subject to paragraph (2), any complaint seeking judicial review of any provision of this Act or any action of the Secretary under this Act shall be filed—

(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), within the 90-day period beginning on the date of the action being challenged; or

(B) in the case of a complaint based solely on grounds arising after such period, within 90 days after the complainant knew or reasonably should have known of the grounds for the complaint.

(2) VENUE.—Any complaint seeking judicial review of any provision of this Act or any action of the Secretary under this Act may be filed only in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

(3) LIMITATION ON SCOPE OF CERTAIN REVIEW.—Judicial review of a Secretarial decision to conduct a lease sale under this Act, including the environmental analysis thereof, shall be limited to whether the Secretary has complied with the terms of this Act and shall be based upon the administrative record of that decision. The Secretary's identification of a preferred course of action to enable leasing to proceed and the Secretary's analysis of environmental effects under this Act shall be presumed to be correct unless shown otherwise by clear and convincing evidence to the contrary.

(b) LIMITATION ON OTHER REVIEW.—Actions of the Secretary with respect to which review could have been obtained under this section shall not be subject to judicial review in any civil or criminal proceeding for enforcement.

SEC. 9. FEDERAL AND STATE DISTRIBUTION OF REVENUES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the amount of adjusted bonus, rental, and royalty revenues from Federal oil and gas leasing and operations authorized under this Act—

(1) 50 percent shall be paid to the State of Alaska; and

(2) except as provided in section 12(d), the balance shall be deposited into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(b) PAYMENTS TO ALASKA.—Payments to the State of Alaska under this section shall be made semiannually.

SEC. 10. RIGHTS-OF-WAY ACROSS THE COASTAL PLAIN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall issue rights-of-way and easements across the Coastal Plain for the transportation of oil and gas—

(1) except as provided in paragraph (2), under section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 185), without regard to title XI of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (30 U.S.C. 3161 et seq.); and

(2) under title XI of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (30 U.S.C. 3161 et seq.), for access authorized by sec-

tions 1110 and 1111 of that Act (16 U.S.C. 3170 and 3171).

(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary shall include in any right-of-way or easement issued under subsection (a) such terms and conditions as may be necessary to ensure that transportation of oil and gas does not result in a significant adverse effect on the fish and wildlife, subsistence resources, their habitat, and the environment of the Coastal Plain, including requirements that facilities be sited or designed so as to avoid unnecessary duplication of roads and pipelines.

(c) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall include in regulations under section 3(g) provisions granting rights-of-way and easements described in subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 11. CONVEYANCE.

In order to maximize Federal revenues by removing clouds on title to lands and clarifying land ownership patterns within the Coastal Plain, the Secretary, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1302(h)(2) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3192(h)(2)), shall convey—

(1) to the Kaktovik Inupiat Corporation the surface estate of the lands described in paragraph 1 of Public Land Order 6959, to the extent necessary to fulfill the Corporation's entitlement under sections 12 and 14 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1611 and 1613) in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Agreement between the Department of the Interior, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Kaktovik Inupiat Corporation effective January 22, 1993; and

(2) to the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation the remaining subsurface estate to which it is entitled pursuant to the August 9, 1983, agreement between the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation and the United States of America.

SEC. 12. LOCAL GOVERNMENT IMPACT AID AND COMMUNITY SERVICE ASSISTANCE.

(a) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may use amounts available from the Coastal Plain Local Government Impact Aid Assistance Fund established by subsection (d) to provide timely financial assistance to entities that are eligible under paragraph (2) and that are directly impacted by the exploration for or production of oil and gas on the Coastal Plain under this Act.

(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—The North Slope Borough, the City of Kaktovik, and any other borough, municipal subdivision, village, or other community in the State of Alaska that is directly impacted by exploration for, or the production of, oil or gas on the Coastal Plain under this Act, as determined by the Secretary, shall be eligible for financial assistance under this section.

(b) USE OF ASSISTANCE.—Financial assistance under this section may be used only for—

(1) planning for mitigation of the potential effects of oil and gas exploration and development on environmental, social, cultural, recreational, and subsistence values;

(2) implementing mitigation plans and maintaining mitigation projects;

(3) developing, carrying out, and maintaining projects and programs that provide new or expanded public facilities and services to address needs and problems associated with such effects, including fire-fighting, police, water, waste treatment, medivac, and medical services; and

(4) establishment of a coordination office, by the north slope borough, in the city of kaktovik, which shall—

(A) coordinate with and advise developers on local conditions, impact, and history of the areas utilized for development; and

(B) provide to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate an annual report on the status of coordination between developers and the communities affected by development.

(c) APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any community that is eligible for assistance under this section may submit an application for such assistance to the Secretary, in such form and under such procedures as the Secretary may prescribe by regulation.

(2) NORTH SLOPE BOROUGH COMMUNITIES.—A community located in the North Slope Borough may apply for assistance under this section either directly to the Secretary or through the North Slope Borough

(3) APPLICATION ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall work closely with and assist the North Slope Borough and other communities eligible for assistance under this section in developing and submitting applications for assistance under this section.

(d) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Treasury the Coastal Plain Local Government Impact Aid Assistance Fund.

(2) USE.—Amounts in the fund may be used only for providing financial assistance under this section.

(3) DEPOSITS.—Subject to paragraph (4), there shall be deposited into the fund amounts received by the United States as revenues derived from rents, bonuses, and royalties from Federal leases and lease sales authorized under this Act.

(4) LIMITATION ON DEPOSITS.—The total amount in the fund may not exceed \$11,000,000.

(5) INVESTMENT OF BALANCES.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall invest amounts in the fund in interest bearing government securities.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To provide financial assistance under this section there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary from the Coastal Plain Local Government Impact Aid Assistance Fund \$5,000,000 for each fiscal year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). Pursuant to House Resolution 835, the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 5429.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, it was brought up during the debate on the rule that this is not a new bill coming before the House. In fact, it is a bill that the House of Representatives has addressed many times in the past. It deals with opening up a small part of the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge to oil and gas exploration.

Mr. Speaker, during the debate today we are going to have the opportunity to hear a lot about the pros and cons of opening up ANWR and the 2,000 acres that are included in the bill. We will talk about supply and the mean estimate of 10.5 billion barrels of oil that are available to Americans today. We will talk about jobs and the number of those in organized labor who look at between 250,000 and a million jobs, good paying family wage jobs that will be created by opening up this area. We will talk about revenue deficit reduction.

CRS recently did a study where they estimate that between \$111 and \$170 billion will come into the Federal Treasury as a result of opening this up. But one thing that we will talk considerably about is the environment and new technology. And to start today's debate on this, I would like to discuss that, because I believe this is probably one of the most important parts of this entire debate. Many times those that oppose new energy in this country, new energy of any kind whether we are talking about ANWR or alternative energy, they consistently vote against it no matter what it is. And what we are trying to do is open up these new energy sources so that we become less dependent on foreign energy instead of more dependent every single year.

When it comes to environmental protection, we have taken that into consideration and have debated this legislation for 25 years. And during those 25 years we have put in more and more in terms of environmental protection. Technology, obviously, has advanced over the last 25 years to the point today where the footprint has been reduced to the size of less than 2,000 acres. They talk about roads, the roads that will be built will be ice roads that will melt away in the summertime. In fact, over half of the bill, over half of the pages in the bill are dedicated to environmental protection. There is nowhere in the world that would have as much in terms of environmental protection and regulation as opening up this area. I do believe that is important. I do believe that it should be included in the bill. That is why it is in the bill.

But I will say that the false choice that we will hear from the other side today is either environmental protection or economic progress and economic development. That is not an option. The option that is in front of us is to protect our environment and to have a healthy, strong growing economy.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have an historic time in our country. It is a time that requires the United States, this Congress, the President, to respond to an energy crisis. Skyrocketing gasoline prices, a real sense that we are importing too much oil from overseas and a real need for us to come together in a

comprehensive way for our country to respond.

We should be debating out here on the House floor today how we radically increase the amount of renewable fuels in our country that is consumed. We have to have a debate out here on the House floor about how we improve all of the vehicles which we drive in terms of their energy efficiency, all of the appliances which we use in our country in order to make them more efficient so we do not have to import so much oil. Instead, the response from the majority is to just bring out this bill, once again, which will not produce the first barrel of oil for at least 10 years in a pristine wildlife refuge in Alaska.

It is a failure not to have this debate be broader, be more comprehensive at this time, so that we can, in fact, 10 years from now, 10 years from now, have energy independence from the Middle East.

This bill will not even produce the first barrel of oil for 10 years. It is a red herring. It is a disservice to the American public. There were no hearings on this bill before it came out. They have changed the language that has always come out on to the House floor dealing with the arctic refuge with no hearings. It is something that should be rejected.

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

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, the estimated oil that would result out of ANWR would be enough to fuel the entire State of Massachusetts for 75 years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the man that has been entrusted to represent the entire State of Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I again thank the gentleman for bringing this legislation to the floor. It is ironic, we listen to the gentleman from Massachusetts say that there has been no hearings. This is the 12th time we have passed this legislation concerning the needs of energy for this country. And by the way, for those listening to this program and those watching, Alaskans want to drill. Alaskans want to produce this oil for America. This is not our oil. We have never claimed that. Alaskans think it is necessary for this Nation.

It is ironic, I heard the gentleman from Massachusetts mention the fact that it will not relieve the high gas prices for 10 years. 10 years ago he said the same thing. I have been trying to do this for 15 years, actually 25 years. Passed it 12 times. President Clinton, by the way, vetoed it. President Clinton vetoed the same piece of legislation. We would have had a million barrels a day now flowing to the American consumer. Your gas prices would not be \$3.25 today. That would not have occurred.

Ironically, it is on the other side, the other side where all those wisdom people live, on the other side there are a group of individuals of the other party

that continue to block this source of fossil fuels to our consumers. Now, it might be, I am not sure it is, it might be they have a gas station in the Russell Building. For some reason, they do not want to produce any more gas. I am not sure that is real, but it could be. For some reason, they do not see the light.

I keep hearing about people supporting alternate sources of energy. And I have been advocating that. I have talked about nuclear. We cannot have nuclear. I have talked about let's burn more coal. We cannot burn coal. I talk about let's build a dam. Let's control the water flow in some of our rivers as it roars into the sea, let's control it and use it because it is truly a renewable source. But they cannot do that either.

All they ask us to do is conserve our way into prosperity. I will suggest to you respectfully that might happen if we did not have any more Americans. If we stopped our childbirth period, you might be able to conserve yourself into prosperity or into energy self-sufficiency. But as long as our population increases, we will consume more fossil fuel.

Now, I have done a little reading on this and ironically, we have a tremendous amount of coal in this country that we do not need to use just for electrical power. We can use it for liquid fuels. Unfortunately, Adolph Hitler did that because he had to. South Africa did it because they had to. Maybe some day we will get to a point we will have to use our coal for liquification also; but in the meantime, the largest source of oil that we know of in America is in Prudhoe Bay and in ANWR. ANWR is 74 miles away from Prudhoe Bay.

By the way, the gentleman from Massachusetts has never been to Prudhoe Bay. He was asked to go there to see this really pristine area which he speaks of. And by the way the people that live there want to drill. The Eskimos, the Inuits, want to drill there, but no, he didn't have the courtesy to go see when we had a hearing in Kaktovik because he knows all, and so do these Senators, they know all. But in the meantime, you are paying \$3.55 for a gallon of gasoline. And yes, that is a lot. But unfortunately, it is going to be more because if we have another Katrina which we might have, God help us, or if there is a hiccup in Iran, or someplace else in the Middle East, or if we have Venezuela who decides not to ship us 1.5 million barrels, you are going to pay more, and yet we have the domestic supply here.

Some would say we have to get off the fossil fuel habit. All right. Let's everybody buy a bicycle. Let's all buy a bicycle, and break our leg, and let's go back to being China. And by the way, who is the largest consumer of automobiles today? It is China, not us. China. They also, when somebody takes me to task, they say, well, they don't burn much fuel. They burn over 2.6 billion barrels of oil a year.

□ 1245

Think about that a moment, and they are going to consume more. We are not the only buyers around the world. There are other buyers.

We have to start developing our fossil fuels. We should be drilling offshore. Some people don't want that. We should be drilling in the Rockies; they don't want that. Most of all, we should be drilling in Alaska, and we want that. So if you don't want to drill in those other areas, if you don't want to burn coal, then at least recognize the valuable oil resource in Alaska.

Let's pass this legislation. Let's get it to the public. Let's make sure they have a source of energy they need. Let's stop listening to the naysayers. Let's do the job today.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I am not from the other side, although I am from the other side on this argument. I am not from the other party. I am proud of my party affiliation, but I rise in strong opposition to this bill which would allow oil drilling in a pristine wilderness that was set aside by that radical environmentalist, Dwight David Eisenhower.

Is there any greater evidence that we are, as President Bush has said, addicted to oil? Astonishingly, this Congress has not voted on a single conservation measure since gasoline hit \$3 a gallon, not a single one, and yet poll after poll shows that conservation measures are the preferred option of the American people for dealing with high gasoline prices, the preferred option by a long shot.

The American public is thirsting to get their hands on fuel-saving technologies that companies are refusing to provide, and we have responded with nothing. Perhaps we have forgotten that our constituents are people, not companies.

The proponents of this bill would like to point out that if this legislation had been passed 11 years ago, ANWR would now be producing oil. Well, I would point out that if Congress had not blocked higher fuel economy standards 11 years ago, we would save far more oil than ANWR would produce. All those savings would increase as ANWR was being depleted.

We really are classic addicts. We would rather keep seeking our oil fix, our heroin, with all its attendant dangers, than shift to conservation, our methadone.

We are a Congress of prodigals who refuse to return home. Instead, we roam the world, laying waste to new territories to continue our spendthrift ways.

We ought not just oppose this bill, we ought to be ashamed of it.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California for the time, and I appreciate my friend from New York who will be leaving this chamber, and I salute him for his own energy efficiency in producing a lot of heat but very little light in this regard.

Here are the facts we confront. No one is against conservation. No one is against alternative fuel sources. Indeed, as the author of the resolution on a solar tax provision passed in the energy bill and one who wants to extend that, I think I offer tangible testimony to embracing new technologies, but the fact is, in our current situation, sadly, we are dependent on foreign oil.

It is a fair question to again put before this House: Mr. Speaker, should we use environmentally responsible ways to explore for energy, especially where there is a proven energy reserve? We have such a reserve in ANWR. And understand the scope of the argument: The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is the size of the State of South Carolina. The area where we would like to explore for the energy is about the size of John Foster Dulles Airport outside Washington, D.C. We should vote for this responsible measure.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

I am listening to my friend from Arizona. Two observations. One, everybody here is for all the good stuff. What matters is whether or not they are willing to actually invest in it. Where are their priorities? Where they are giving billions of dollars in unjustified breaks to oil companies who do not even need it, as opposed to starving investments in other programs.

The reference here to having a footprint the size of Dulles airport, hogwash. That is like saying a 300-acre golf course is actually only computed by the 4¼ inch in diameter golf holes. Do the math. That ends up to be about 240 square inches. But it ignores the golf paths. It ignores the tool shed, the clubhouse. It ignores the irrigation system, the tool sheds, the restrooms.

The fact is that the 2,000 acres, multiplied by all the ancillary activities, extends to a wide, wide area, and the notion of using things like ice roads, of course the other side does not believe in global warming, but if you look at the shorter and shorter period of time each year that you can use ice roads, you find out that that is becoming less active.

You have 20 years before you get peak production to have ultimately a penny a gallon saving. It is a foolish investment. This is the last place we should be drilling, not the next.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I am the only person in this Congress that has

ever lived on the north slope for over a year. I know what pristine means. If we put you down there in the middle of winter, you would not think pristine. If we put you down in summer, which is 2 weeks in July, with the mosquitos, you would not think pristine, but once you live there and learn to appreciate what has happened there, it becomes pristine, but that should not be the issue.

This bill is an insurance policy against dependence on foreign oil. Let us develop this, not to consume it. Let us develop this resource, find out where we are, to have an insurance policy against foreign oil price gougers. Let us give our folks some protection at the pump by filling in this one piece. Again, exploration; not for consumption. Exploration is pressure against foreign oil suppliers now as we develop alternative forms of energy as we increase conservation.

I arrived here in a hydrogen car a few minutes ago. I never would have thought that would have happened. That is an alternative. E-85, I have got a bill to do that, again, to take away our dependence, but don't take this piece away from us. It will help us. It is not about consumption; it is about conservation.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and rise in opposition to the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 5429, the so-called American-Made Energy and Good Jobs Act. Once again, we will spend valuable legislative hours debating drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

In the past few years, the House has repeatedly taken vote after vote on this issue. In each instance, Congress has ultimately not supported the opening of this refuge that was set aside by President Eisenhower 45 years ago.

The development footprint on the region, even using the most advanced technology and methods, would significantly disrupt this fragile ecosystem. Think about every heavy industrial factory and facility you know of, and then superimpose that image on a wilderness like Yellowstone Park or the National Forest or Park in your own home state and ask yourself if that is the legacy you want for your children.

Proponents of the bill argue that the 2,000 acre limitation on drilling would localize disruptions. However, this is only a gimmick: it fails to recognize the expansive nature of roads, pipelines, and machinery that will be built across 1.5 million acres. Rather, it is a cynical attempt to confuse and discount the effect of widespread development and blight on the entire region.

Other, more effective solutions to our energy needs exist. In addition to reviewing our domestic production capacity, focusing greater attention on renewable energy sources, alternate fuels, and more efficient systems and appliances would yield more net energy savings than could come from ANWR, and that priority would have a higher benefit for the nation's economic leadership and security.

I urge you to help put an end to the "drill ANWR first" solution and help move the Congress toward real energy security. Vote "No" on H.R. 5429.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I am as concerned about oil prices at the pump as anyone. My constituents and I feel the pinch every single day, but as we consider this bill, let us look at the facts.

Ninety-five percent of the north slope is available for drilling, and it is roughly flat. There are 4,000 offshore leases that oil companies hold but have not yet developed. The government is offering leases in the National Petroleum Reserve regularly and just last week leased up 2.8 million acres more.

Directly relevant to this legislation is the fact that BP tried to develop wells adjacent to ANWR and recently moth-balled those wells because they produced so much less than expected.

On the other hand, developments in the alpine fields, which is way west of ANWR, (there is ANWR; Prudhoe Bay and then the alpine fields) those wells produced twice as much as expected, 120,000 barrels per day versus the expected 60,000 barrels today.

Lastly, existing fields are good for 20 to 25 years. They are almost entirely on State reserve lands, and we are now expanding leasing on State reserve lands, as well as Federal Reserve lands with very good success.

President Harding set aside the National Petroleum Reserve when the Navy converted from coal to oil to assure a supply of oil for the Navy in the future. That supply is assured without ANWR. Oppose this bill. Drilling in ANWR is not necessary or called for. Preserve the unique, pristine ecosystem.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I rise just to point out that the estimated oil from ANWR would fuel the State of Connecticut for 132 years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES).

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for taking me to ANWR 4 years ago now. It was really an eye-opening experience for me. I was expecting to see beautiful water running through streams and trees and animals running around, and Mr. Chairman, that is not what we saw when we got there.

In fact, what we saw was just a barren slope. It is a barren slope, and with gas at \$3 a gallon and some places like California approaching \$4, it is time that the Congress pass this and make this into law.

I just want to point out to the American people that one of the reasons that this continues to be used as propaganda by the environmental community is because it is their number one source of fundraising throughout the country to use in political campaigns.

So I would hope that we would pass this here today in the House, and I would hope eventually we can move this through the Senate.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs).

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I rise in strong opposition to this so-called energy and jobs bill. There are simply some places that should be off limits to drilling. The arctic refuge is one of them.

I was privileged to visit this wildlife refuge and to camp on the shores. It is not a barren slope. The harm to polar bears, to caribou, millions of migratory birds and to the subsistence way of life to the natives there would be irreversible.

We have a moral responsibility to save wild places like the arctic refuge for future generations, and that is why our country has remained committed to its protection for nearly 50 years.

Drilling in the refuge will not solve America's energy problem. The Energy Department's own figures show that drilling would not change gas prices by more than a penny a gallon, and this would be 20 years from now. With 3 percent of the world's resources and 25 percent of the world's demand, it is pretty obvious this country cannot drill its way to energy security.

What we need to do is really improve energy efficiency standards, develop in full scale renewable and alternative energy and use the one resource we have in abundance, our creativity.

This bill is just a continuation of the backward thinking energy policies that have gotten us here in the first place.

Americans deserve cheaper, quicker, safer, cleaner energy policies that also safeguard the wild places we care so deeply about. This desperate obsession with drilling off our coastlines and in the arctic refuge has distracted us long enough.

It is time for Congress to stop wasting energy and start working on real and clean energy solutions.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1300

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this issue.

We have, as many have said, been through this issue before, but we have never been here in this situation. The suggestion is by those individuals that somehow, if we just drill ANWR, that we will have lower gasoline prices in the United States. Maybe they do not know it, but they should know it, that there is only now one price of oil. It is the world price of oil. The last time we had lower prices in the United States, the oil companies drilling in ANWR

sought to export that oil to Japan rather than sell it into the United States.

So these are not benevolent societies. These are profit-making organizations. And if the world price of oil is \$70 a barrel, it will be \$70 a barrel in ANWR. If it is \$100 a barrel it will be \$100 a barrel from ANWR. So the idea America is going to get this fix out of ANWR just isn't true. By the time ANWR comes on line, it may be 4 percent of imports. We should not ignore that, but the fact of the matter is, as so many people have pointed out, there is much more that we can do.

Many people have referred to the fact that the President stood here and told us we were addicted to oil. Well, the supporters of this legislation and the President of the United States are acting just like addicts. What they are doing is looking for one more quick fix. One more fix and then they will get religion tomorrow. One more fix and they will get well. One more fix and they will go into treatment.

What they are telling us is that they have postponed conservation, they have postponed new technologies, and they have postponed new sources of energy. This is the most oil-friendly administration in recent times, and we still find that we cannot meet the demands of this country. Because rather than deal with our demands, rather than deal with the technologies and the innovations that are available to us today, they have put all of their money on the oil companies. They put it there with royalty relief. They put it there with incentives. They have put it there with bonus bid systems and they have put it there with drilling in ANWR. It is a bankrupt policy.

What they are now doing in the 11th hour, while American consumers suffer from \$3.00 and \$3.50 gasoline, they are buying a lottery ticket. They are buying a lotto ticket called ANWR. And they are hoping to be able to redeem it. When it doesn't work, America will be deeper in debt and more dependent on foreign sources of oil than they are today. Because if they can get ANWR, they can once again postpone the commitments to conservation and technology.

They can scare you by suggesting Venezuela may cut off its oil. Well, let me tell you, ladies and gentlemen, they may sell that oil to the Chinese, but it is going to be refined in my district. Because the Chinese can't refine that oil. We know that most oil changes hands from the time it leaves one shore to get to the other shore. It may change ownership three or four times, sometimes as much as a dozen times. And it changes destination. But the fact of the matter is, it is not very attractive oil that Mr. Chavez is trying to sell or put on to the market.

So we have to understand what this means. What this comes down to really is about a sense of the future and our values. This ANWR, and I have been there, I meet the test. I have been

there, I have explored it, I have slept overnight there, I have stayed out and camped out in this area, so let me talk about it. This is about a pristine area that you either make a decision to industrialize or you don't.

The 2,000-acre footprint is a hoax. There is another 69,000 acres under Indian jurisdiction. They can build airports and they can do whatever they want. That is the nature of our relationship with the Indian tribes. So the 2,000 acres is a hoax. It is a decision about the value of this place, this very special place, and whether or not you are going to industrialize it.

Then it comes down to whether or not you believe in the ingenuity and the creativity of America. When we put together our innovation agenda, we met with the CEOs of the most advanced companies in the world. And they said to us, put energy innovation on the table, and you will drive a new generation of technology, a new generation of economic activity, and new jobs in America.

What are they putting on the table? They are putting on the table the old tired policy that somehow America can drill its way out of this problem. No, it can't. There's nobody who believes that is the situation. But you chose to stick with the 1960s, a 1970s policy, a 1980s policy, a 1990s policy. We would like to think about this century and new innovation and new places to go, and the excitement of new technologies, where America once again sells to the world those cutting-edge technologies.

We should not abandon wind energy to the Scandinavians, to the Europeans, and to the Spanish. No, we should have those technologies. We should be making the investments in alternative sources of energy and alternative sources of fuel. That is not what this legislation is about. This is about the one last lottery ticket, the one last gamble that the American people lose with this legislation.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Resources Committee.

This is an interesting debate. I want to try to refocus it a little bit more on the facts. The entire State of Texas, since oil was discovered in 1894, in Corsicana, Texas, has produced about 60 billion barrels of oil in over a million and a half wells in the last 112 years, 60 billion barrels. That is the number-one oil producing State in the United States.

The ANWR best-case estimate is, and this is the best case, it could be higher or lower, but the median case is 8 billion barrels in one field. That is 8 billion barrels. The second or third largest hydrocarbon bearing geology on the North American continent, and we have drilled one well. One well.

Gas prices everywhere in this Nation are somewhere in the neighborhood of \$3 a gallon, in some regions they are higher and in some regions a little lower, and we can't drill the third largest hydrocarbon bearing geology in North American continent?

They talk about the pristine nature, and it is pristine. I have been there. In my hometown of Arlington, Texas, right now there are drilling rigs within 300 feet of homes. Three hundred feet. Now, they are drilling for natural gas in the Barnett Shale, and you are telling me in Alaska that we can't drill a couple hundred wells that might produce as much as 2 million barrels a day for 30 years and lower gasoline prices for every American driver as much as 30 to 40 cents a gallon when in full production? That just doesn't make sense.

Please vote for this bill. Let's have a little common sense. Send it to the Senate and pass a reasonable supply-side policy in support of our energy policy.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is left on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 16 minutes remaining and the gentleman from California has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this issue.

Opening up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to drilling is not the answer to high gas prices today or to the long-term energy needs of tomorrow. The fact is, we are addicted to oil. The proponents of this bill would have you believe that the only way to cure an addict is to feed the addiction at whatever cost, regardless of the effect on the environment, wildlife, or public health. Now, as a psychiatric social worker by profession, I can tell you this is not the way you kick a habit.

The best way to fight high gas prices now is to go after the suppliers. We should hold oil companies accountable for gouging consumers at the pump. We should institute a windfall profits tax to fund immediate investments in energy efficiency, conservation, and research into clean and sustainable sources of energy.

Instead of implementing these policies 5 years ago, this administration deliberately, they deliberately chose to fatten the wallets of its cronies in the oil and gas industry to feed this addiction. Let us not make the same mistake again.

Kick the habit and vote against this bill.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I, of course, rise today in strong support of H.R. 5429. I have been an avid proponent of

opening the 1002 area of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge for a long, long time now.

In 1980, when the Congress and President Carter created the nearly 20 million acres for ANWR, they set aside 1.5 million acres of ANWR's northern coastal plain for the express purpose of future energy exploration and development. I think the 96th Congress got it right when they did this, and I think it is about time we start to think about our children, our grandchildren, and our great grandchildren.

You know, to say that we shouldn't drill on ANWR and that it will ruin little ANWR, 19 million acres, if we drill on 2,000 small acres, that is an insult to the American people's intelligence. And it is a threat to every youngster who is in the seventh grade on up, that they might have to fight a war for energy. This country will fight for energy. We will send them overseas for energy if we have to.

Let us pass this bill and have their quest be what branch of service do I not have to go into and what university can I enter?

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5429. I have been an avid proponent of opening the 1002 area of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge for a very long time now. In 1980, when the Congress and President Carter created the nearly 20 million acres for ANWR, they set aside 1.5 million acres of ANWR's northern coastal plain for the express purpose of future energy exploration and development. I think the 96th Congress got it right when they did this, and I think it's about time we started to think about our children, our grandchildren and our great-grandchildren and moved forward with energy independence by using our own domestic resources. We are not going to turn the refuge into one giant oil well. In fact, of the 1.5 million acres set aside for exploration, the total amount of surface area covered by production facilities, such as drilling platforms or airstrips, would only be 2,000 acres. As well, H.R. 5429 includes an export ban of all oil or gas obtained from ANWR. All oil and natural gas produced on ANWR's northern Coastal Plain would be for domestic use only.

Mr. Speaker, we need this bill to help reach our goal of energy independence, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, just a few moments ago, Ken Lay and Jeff Skilling were convicted on all counts for cooking the books at Enron, yet that is exactly what is going on with this legislation today by perpetrating this fraud on the American taxpayer that they can expect a 50-50 split on the royalties received up in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, when we know today that is not true and it is not going to happen.

In fact, the State of Alaska, the legislature, last year, passed a resolution saying 50-50 is not acceptable, and

under the Alaska Statehood Act, they demand a 90-10 share. Our own friend and colleague from Alaska, Mr. YOUNG, was recently quoted in the Anchorage Daily News, and I quote, "I have to say 50-50 is something I don't relish. I think it's totally illegal. I believe we can win it in court."

This will cost the American taxpayer tens of billions of dollars if we don't get something in writing now before this legislation advances. I guess it is a good thing there is a Speech and Debate Clause in this Congress, because there is a whole lot of cooking the books in regards to the royalty that the American taxpayer can receive from private oil companies drilling in this pristine national wildlife refuge.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, opening up ANWR would give the State of Wisconsin 83 years of supply; and with that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, my friends across the aisle are animated and engaged in this debate, and I commend them for that. But I would like to just offer one thought, and that is, Mr. Speaker, they can't have it both ways. They just can't have it both ways. They can't be against everything that gets put on the table.

One thing we know for certain is that Americans are very, very tired of what they are paying at the pump. Another thing we know for certain is that actions from decades ago have caused the situation that we have before us today. And if we were to say there is a legacy that has been left us by environmental extremists, the high prices at the pump are it.

We don't explore for domestic oil because extremist environmental groups and liberals here in Congress oppose it. We haven't built a new refinery since the 1970s because extremist environmental groups and liberals here in Congress oppose it. The Democratic party is aligned with these groups that have supported having higher prices as a way to discourage oil usage. Their Presidential nominee in 2000, Al Gore, is not shy about praising higher prices for fuels.

Despite these facts, our liberal colleagues are out there slamming Republicans for high gas prices. Well, you know, they can't have it both ways. They have got to be consistent. Well, they are consistent. They are going to be consistent in opposing drilling in ANWR.

So today, we need to do a little setting the record straight and we need to put a little pressure on those that have chosen to stymie domestic exploration. We need to let the American people know that yes, indeed, there is a choice, and that there is indeed a way to lower fuel prices.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST).

Mr. GILCREST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think there are two things both sides of the aisle can agree with today. Demand is up. We look at our country, China, and India, and the price is up. Those are two things we all agree on.

What we don't agree on, I guess, which is why we have this debate this afternoon, is supply. The United States Government, including the Army Corps of Engineers, recently completed a study saying that peak oil is real; supply is down. Drilling for oil in ANWR, regardless of how much limited supply is there, will not, will not bring the price down.

The world burns, burns, 25 billion barrels of oil a year. We burn it.

□ 1315

ANWR will bring us about 5 billion barrels. That will postpone the world decline in oil reserves by only 2 or 3 months. Once we burn it, and the key word here is burn, once we burn it, it is gone. What is at the bottomless well? It is not oil. As some of the speakers have said, it is ingenuity, it is intellect, and it is initiative.

What else do we have oil use for? We have it for pharmaceutical products and medical products. We have it for plastic products. We have it for asphalt and the fabric of this civilization, and we are burning the legacy of our children's future.

Let us hold this one area for its pristine beauty and oil reserves for our children's future.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH).

Mr. RADANOVICH. I rise in strong support of H.R. 5429, the American-Made Energy and Good Jobs Act.

It is simple math: ANWR equals more oil supply and more oil supply equals lower prices; therefore, ANWR equals lower oil prices for American consumers.

Under this measure, just 2,000 acres of the 19-million-acre Arctic National Wildlife Refuge would be used for energy production. It is only 1 percent of the total mass of land area.

Opening ANWR's 2,000 acres to safe energy exploration would create jobs in all 50 States. New research by the Defense Council Foundation estimates that over 1 million new jobs would be created by opening up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

This act requires that the best commercial practices be used for energy production combined with the world's toughest environmental safeguards. ANWR is not the only solution for our Nation's energy needs, but it is a crucial element.

A report from the U.S. Energy Information Agency shows that energy development in ANWR would increase domestic production by nearly 20 percent by 2025. Had ANWR been in 15 years ago, it would be lowering oil prices today. I absolutely support renewable, clean energy resources. However, we have to be realistic. To get the equivalent amount of energy from wind gen-

eration as in ANWR, we would need 3.7 million acres' worth of wind farms, which is the size of Rhode Island and Connecticut combined, and gale-force winds 365 days a year for more than 30 years.

The American people believe we are doing the right thing by considering this bill today. A recent national poll by PacWest Communications shows that 59 percent of Americans favor oil and gas exploration and production in ANWR because our gas is at \$3 a gallon now.

Given this, I urge my colleagues to do the right thing for American families and support H.R. 5429.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5429, yet another misguided bill that mistakenly believes we can drill or dig our way out of our current energy crisis. The supporters of the measure will argue yet again that drilling in this environmentally fragile area is the magic elixir to cure all of our energy woes. They will say we can lower gas prices and create hundreds of thousands of jobs, all while protecting the delicate ecosystem in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Unfortunately, those claims are based on wishful thinking and are not grounded in fact.

The fact is that drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge will have no significant impact on our Nation's energy independence. All it will do is continue to pursue failed policies and priorities.

Last year, Congress passed an energy bill that provided massive tax giveaways to the oil and gas companies. One year later, energy costs have actually risen, and so have the profits of oil and gas companies. We missed a chance to take a hard look at the global energy forecast and plan accordingly to protect American interests.

Mr. Speaker, we should be making major investments in energy self-reliance, infrastructure, and new technologies. It astonishes me that the Nation that pulled together to put a man on the Moon is not leading the world in developing new, clean, and renewable energy sources.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill and vote against drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5429, yet another misguided bill that mistakenly believes that we can drill or dig our way out of our current energy crisis. The supporters of the measure will argue yet again that drilling in this environmentally fragile area is the magic elixir to cure all our energy woes. They will say that we can lower gas prices and create hundreds of thousands of jobs, all while protecting the delicate ecosystem in the wildlife refuge. Unfortunately, those claims are based on wishful thinking and not grounded in fact. The fact is that drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge will have no significant

impact on our Nation's energy independence. All it would do is continue to pursue failed policies and priorities.

Last year, Congress passed an energy bill that provided massive tax giveaways to the oil and gas companies. One year later, energy costs have actually risen, and so have the profits of oil and gas companies. We missed a chance to take a hard look at the global energy forecast and plan accordingly to protect American interests. Rising demand by India and China will likely guarantee high oil prices in the future, whether or not we drill in the Arctic. Instead, we should be making major investments in energy self-reliance, infrastructure, and new technologies. It astonishes me that the nation that pulled together to put an American on the moon is not leading the world in developing new, clean and renewable energy sources. Such an effort would revitalize our economy, improve our environment, and strengthen our national security. Instead of that type of vision, however, the leadership in Congress and the White House just offers Americans more backwards and wasteful policies like drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

It is telling that the Rules Committee did not allow amendments on this bill. If we had a broader debate about energy policy, we might have to confront the fact that a minimal increase in automobile fuel efficiency standards would have a greater impact on gasoline costs and energy independence than drilling in the Arctic Refuge would. We might have to admit that we can guarantee more well-paying American jobs by developing new clean technologies. Yet we were denied that debate.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the failed policies of the past. Vote against drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of the legislation authorizing oil and gas exploration in ANWR. The House debated this bill many times, and many of the arguments are so familiar I think that some of us could stand up here without even talking points; but I think we need to hear some other points today.

Most importantly, oil and gas development does not destroy the environment. This bill only affects 2,000 acres out of 1.5 million acres. Oil and gas development on the North Slope has not reduced wildlife, destroyed caribou or other animals. I have been to Alaska and the North Slope a number of times. In fact, when I was there one time in August, the only thing I saw was white because it was a blizzard. That was in the middle of August. I don't know, maybe global warming has changed that since I was there 6 years ago.

We have been pumping at Prudhoe Bay for 30 years, and that is just 80 miles west of ANWR. The less we produce domestically, the more oil tankers we have to bring into our ports. And at least the oil tankers in Alaska are U.S. flag ships and we know they are U.S. crews, unlike the tankers that bring in the oil from other places

in the world that are staffed by anyone.

It is true that passing this bill will not lower gas prices immediately, but in the medium term it will. If we had opened the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in 2000–2001, that supply would have helped us when the Gulf of Mexico production was shut down last year because of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

When oil is flowing from ANWR to the continental United States, our economy would be much stronger. The price for oil in the U.S. would have fewer spikes, and we would be less vulnerable to foreign nations using the "oil weapon."

Opponents of ANWR also say we should do alternatives instead of ANWR. We need to do both. I supported the energy bill with its historic move to ethanol, and I fully support major U.S. research efforts into alternative transportation technologies. However, there is not enough corn in the U.S. to make 100 percent ethanol for all the U.S. cars, and hydrogen fuel cells are still years away for the average American.

Most of us are going to be using gasoline made from crude oil for the next 15–20 years. Oil and gas development in ANWR is not the final solution, but it is the bridge to the future of energy technology.

Finally, ANWR is also an important issue for working families who are most at risk from the spikes in the price of gasoline and who are the least able to take advantage of these alternatives.

This legislation is expected to provide 250,000 to 1 million jobs for American families, and that is why organized labor supports this bill. Many opponents of ANWR drive SUVs, and they can afford the high gas prices. In my district, they cannot afford the high cost of hybrids. But working families are going to need affordable gasoline for the next 15–20 years until the price of alternatives comes down.

Mr. Speaker, you can be pro-ANWR and pro-alternative, and that is why I ask support for H.R. 5429.

Environmentally fragile, I have heard that so much. I represent an area on the western Gulf of Mexico, and we are also environmentally fragile, but we have been producing for America for a number of years. We just need some help from other areas in our Nation.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear any mention when my colleague from New York spoke as to how much the fuel needs of New York would be met if ANWR were allowed to go through. I suggest that it probably would be somewhere in the range of 10 years, maybe. What about after that? What do we do after that? This is a red herring. This is a distraction. This is not about any one particular State's needs. This is about the needs of our country. Why are we not addressing the needs of our country?

This is like dressing a pimple on the cheek of an elephant when the problem is the entire elephant. We need to be looking out for the interests of the entire country, not just one particular State and its needs.

We should be talking about alternative fuel sources and developing them in this country. This whole discussion is a political misdirection and a ploy to take the focus off the issues this country is facing today.

I ask my colleagues to reject this political ploy. Vote against this bill. Do not allow the pristine country that we are talking about, ANWR, to be disrupted. Let us leave it for future generations, as it is meant to be.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, is it too much to ask for us to protect the last remaining 5 percent of the Alaskan coast? Is that too much to ask? To give to the Creator his pristine creation?

We do not put oil derricks in Yellowstone National Park. We do not put them in Zion National Park. We do not put them in Mount Rainier National Park, and we should not industrialize this precious Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

There is a pattern here. There is a pattern. Ken Lay and Jeff Skilling were just convicted of fraud on what Enron did to us. And this administration and this Congress let Enron take billions of dollars from ratepayers because they were in fact in the pockets of these energy companies.

Now we have a similar situation. I will never forget when DICK CHENEY looked at us and we begged for help from him to stop Ken Lay and Jeff Skilling from taking money from ratepayers, and you know what he told us, he said you Democrats just don't understand markets.

Now I guess we just don't understand energy either. We understand that we should protect the national jewels in the crown of this country. Vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, here we are again debating a bill that has been rejected by Congress and the American people too many times to count. So how many times do we have to go through this obsessive exercise? How many times will we waste our time debunking the myth that drilling in the Arctic will solve our energy problems and make us energy independent? How many times do we have to reject the notion that drilling will not harm the native peoples or the environment of the Arctic? How many times will the sponsors of this measure try to hide the fact that it will do nothing to reduce gas prices?

Mr. Speaker, our country needs real solutions to our energy problems,

namely, one that is affordable, stable and reduces the impact on the environment. Instead of wasting our time with this stale proposal that has been rejected so many times, let us spend time on incentives for clean air technologies and stop this head-in-the-sand approach to energy policy.

This is a great country. Let us start acting like we have the will and the ability to face the challenges of the future, and we can begin by rejecting H.R. 5429.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, our friends on the other side of the aisle state that we should be discussing and using alternative energies. I agree. But where are they going to get them?

The veterans in my district drive 305 miles one way from my hometown to the VA clinic. That is 305 miles. Where are they going to stop and fill up their car with this alternative energy that our friends are talking about today?

Many of the spots in New Mexico have no primary provider, health care providers, and yet our opponents want to simply gloss over that fact and say we need wind energy. When is wind energy going to start fueling these cars? The truth of the American situation today is we drive cars. We have large, expansive spaces in many States, and the only source of gasoline is from petroleum. Now what we have today is a \$3 price on gasoline. That is because we had choices in the past not to develop our refineries, number one; or, number two, not to increase the supply of petroleum products. We are paying \$3 a gallon today because of our decisions.

If we choose not to develop energy in this country, we are on the way to \$4, \$5 and \$6 a gallon gasoline because our friends in the rest of the world are beginning to demand more.

When I look at a chart of crude oil prices over a period of years, I can see when it is overlaid with the demand of the Chinese, the demand of the Chinese is increasing just about like the price of crude oil is increasing. There is no accident in that. The price of petroleum is where it is, not through the simplistic explanations of our friends. The price of petroleum is where it is because of the law of supply and demand. That law of supply and demand says when the supply is less, you will pay more, which is exactly what we are doing today.

Vote for the bill, expand the drilling and give the American consumer a lower price for gasoline at the pump.

□ 1330

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, while Rome is burning, we are eating grapes. We waste energy. We consume 25 percent of the world's energy, yet only 2.7 percent of the world's oil reserves are in the United States of America. We are depleting our savings account.

The President was right. We are addicted to oil.

GEORGE MILLER and other Members of Congress are right. We are addicted to oil. We are addicted to fossil fuel. We consume fossil fuel at an alarming rate. We need to conserve.

Mr. BOEHLERT is right. The proponents of this bill like to point out that if this legislation had been enacted 11 years ago, ANWR would now be producing oil. But Mr. BOEHLERT points out if we had higher conservation standards 11 years ago, we would save more oil than we would get from ANWR.

The bottom line to me is very clear. ANWR is a national set aside area. It is a pristine area. It is a small part of Alaska and should not be mined.

Why don't we mine the rest of Alaska, all the other parts of the northern slope and the rest of Alaska?

We have only 2.7 percent of the world's oil reserves. We need to say "no" to the mining of ANWR, "yes" to exploring other areas, "yes" to other energy including, renewable energy, "yes" to conservation. Increase the mileage standards of SUVs, minivans and trucks, increase the mileage standards of cars, and we will save far more than we will ever get from ANWR.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, the urgency and that the last speaker said that we should save our assets, keep the money in the bank. I had a friend whose father was in his 80s. His father did not spend much money. His son went to his dad one day and said, Dad, you are putting every penny in the bank; why are you doing that? He said, I am going to save it until I am old. The son said, Dad, if you are not there yet, you better start spending your money.

I don't know at what point the opponents of this legislation say that the price has to get to before we start spending out of our savings account. But if \$70 a barrel doesn't compel you that we should dip into that savings account, I am not sure where you are going to be compelled.

The fact is that we have the resources. We need to utilize the resources. We need to buy ourselves the time while we convert to these renewables that were incentivized in the energy bill last year. But the renewables are going to take 20 years to get to market. I am not sure when our opponents feel like we should dip into that savings account. I think it is today.

Mr. Speaker, I support the bill.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY).

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, war is not an acceptable energy policy. This bill is an attempt to dupe the American public into thinking that drilling in ANWR will lower gas prices. It is a disservice to the American people. This bill is really about serving ANWR to

the oil industry lobby, something they have coveted for a very long time.

Just by making cars modestly more efficient, Americans could save \$25 billion a year and 1 million barrels of oil per day. Republicans should really deal with our energy problems and not this handout to the oil lobby.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, it is like a broken record. The majority is trying to drill our way to energy independence. Last week, they were trying to drill off our coasts, and this week, it is ANWR. Even the big oil companies know that oil in ANWR would only fill America's appetite for oil for maybe 6 months and that it would not be available for 10 years.

To reduce the pain of high-fuel costs for America's families, we need to use existing technology to make our cars, our SUVs and light trucks go farther on a gallon of gas. We need to raise CAFE standards. We need to invest in alternative energies and alternative fuels. We need to become independent of fossil fuels. We need to vote against this bill and head in the right direction and not drilling off our coasts or in ANWR.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT).

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in the last year, two major studies were done at the expense of our U.S. Government; one by the Department of Energy, the other by the U.S. Army; both indicating that we are at or will shortly be at peak oil with potentially devastating consequences for our country.

But drilling ANWR now is not an appropriate response to that. We have only about 2 percent of the world's reserves of the oil. We use 25 percent of the world's oil. We import about two-thirds of what we use.

Mr. Speaker, with those statistics, I am having a lot of trouble understanding how it is in our national security interest to use up a little bit of oil as quickly as we can.

If we could drill ANWR tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, what would we do the day after tomorrow? Talking about tomorrow, we are saddling our children, our grandchildren, with an unconscionable debt. Will we add to that the insult of using up the little bit of liquid fossil fuels remaining? This is not the right thing to do at this time.

Mr. POMBO. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, drilling in ANWR brings us no closer to breaking our dependence on oil, even under

the most optimistic scenario. Many of us have spent the last several years working to find ways to stem the hemorrhaging of factory jobs in this country.

Nothing would do that like lowering the energy costs for our manufacturers, for our chemical and fertilizer plants. If we open ANWR, we tell our manufacturers that we are satisfied with holding the line. If we want to create more than a few good jobs and spur the economy on a scale that could rival what we saw in the 1990s with the rise of the Internet, we should not be debating whether or not to open ANWR to drilling. We should boldly invest in renewable energy everywhere in our country. We should look not to the past but to the future. We should vote "no" on this bill and "yes" to reducing our dependence on oil.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, look, this bill makes no sense at all: drilling for dead dinosaurs and making that more valuable than liveable wildlife is just crazy. Even the Governor of California opposed offshore drilling last week. All the people of California oppose drilling in ANWR. I strongly support a "no" vote.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5429, legislation to open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil drilling. It's the same bad idea now as it was the last 12 times we voted on and defeated this issue.

The House Leadership just doesn't get it. Last week on a bipartisan basis we defeated an amendment to develop and drill for gas on the outer continental shelf.

We cannot drill our way out of high gas prices with this bill or any other piece of legislation. It just isn't possible.

We are missing an opportunity here; today's misguided attempt continues to bumble along searching for 19th century answers to 21st century problems. We need 21st century solutions such as conservation and using renewable and alternative sources.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today has been touted as a "fix" to high gas prices by the proponents of this legislation. It will not lower prices now or later.

Even the Bush Administration's own Energy Information Administration (EIA) estimates that at best the addition of oil from the Arctic Refuge to our supplies would maybe, and this is a big maybe, lower the price of gas by a penny . . . 20 years from now.

On the other hand, if we were to pass meaningful increases to our CAFE standards and increased average fuel economy by 3 miles per gallon, consumers could be saving as much as \$25 billion a year in fuel costs within a few short years.

During his State of the Union Address, the President acknowledged our addiction to oil.

I hoped that this would mean Congress could move forward to discuss real energy solutions, solutions that protect our national security, our citizens, and our environment, as I continue to believe that we can do. Instead as we go into the summer driving season, the only ideas that have had a voice on this floor is for drilling in our oceans and our pristine areas.

Mr. Speaker, when are we going to move past this divisive debate to discuss real energy solutions for the 21st century?

I urge this leadership and this administration to develop meaningful legislation based on new technologies that lead us to energy independence. I oppose this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same. H.R. 5429 continues the Republican energy solution of postponing real action.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI).

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for engaging in this debate. More so, I want to thank him for taking us to Alaska, a whole group of us. Several weeks ago, many of us went up to the village of Kaktovik and had a chance to sit with the Inupiat people and talk to them about what it is they really wanted on their lands.

I represent more Native Americans than anyone else in Congress. While I was there, they talked about a sovereignty issue. We had 400 people in the gym. We asked them, how many people don't want us using the newest technologies to go after this resource? Two people stood up. One was a white woman from San Francisco, a lawyer.

So I am telling you, from the people, they want sovereignty. They want their own self-determination. They want to be able to use their own resources to better themselves and better their lives. Seventy-five percent of the people of Alaska want to use new technology to go after this.

It is not a silver bullet. To say it is, is a false argument. It is an energy bridge. It allows us to bring enough hydrocarbon fuel down in the 48 States to help us bridge to the next energy generation, from a guy who drives a hybrid, because I know that argument is going to come up, a guy who drives a hybrid, not those big SUVs like they drive up there in Boston. Vote "yes" on this bill, and let's get it done.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a historic debate. We have OPEC and the oil industry tipping consumers upside-down at the pump every single day. Rather than having a debate out here on the House floor on the amount of alternative renewable fuels we use which would dramatically increase by millions of barrels a day; rather than debating out here on the floor how we would increase the fuel efficiency standards over the next 10 years of all of the vehicles we drive in the United States, which would push out additional millions of barrels of oil a day, so that, 10 years from today, there would be no imported oil from the OPEC countries, no imported oil from the Persian Gulf; instead, we are debating a bill which won't produce the first barrel of oil for 10 years, and it will come from a pristine wildlife refuge.

That just shows you how bankrupt the Republican energy strategy is. It is almost Memorial Day weekend. Mil-

lions of drivers are getting ready to go to the pump to get ready for their long drives only to pay \$3.20, \$3.40 a gallon. The answer from the Republican party is, we will help you 10 years from now from a gas station we create in the pristine wildlife refuge in Alaska to send oil down to California to put into SUVs to get 15 miles a gallon. That is not the answer to this crisis.

We have a choice, make our country more addicted to oil or chart a new direction. We need cleaner air and water rather than more pollution. We need abundant, renewable energy and more efficient vehicles to drive in our country. We put 70 percent of all the oil we consume into gasoline tanks.

Instead, we are here talking about something that will not happen for 10 years. The American people want to know, when will the Congress stand up for them and make sure that the oil industry and OPEC stops sticking them up at the pump? Because our country has been paralyzed for 6 years by this Congress and by the Republican White House, which unfortunately is still too controlled by the oil industry vote to ensure that we protect this Arctic National Wildlife Refuge from being exploited.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we have had this debate before many, many times with all of my colleagues that had an opportunity to come to the floor today and voice their opinions.

Quite frankly, this is about a lot more than just opening up ANWR. We have narrowed this down to a couple of thousand acres out of an area nearly the size of 100 million acres, and that is what this bill actually deals with. But, obviously, we have heard a lot about energy policy in general.

Unfortunately, our energy policy in this country for the last 30 years has basically been to become more and more and more dependent on foreign energy sources.

Every time an idea has come forward about opening up a new area, about creating more domestic energy, about keeping jobs here at home, those on the minority side have voted against it. We have heard them talk a lot today about alternative energy and renewable energy, and they are right. We need to invest in renewable energy and alternative energy. They are absolutely correct on that.

In fact, last year, we had a vote on alternative renewable energy, and almost every single one of them voted against it. They are not consistent in terms of their arguments and their votes. Quite frankly, we do need to adopt an energy policy that really does reflect the future of America.

But unless we have people that are willing to create domestic energy, whether that be from increased fossil fuels or whether it be from renewables, we need to have a policy that creates

increased domestic energy. Right now we don't have that policy.

ANWR is not the answer. ANWR is a small part of the answer. All of the things that you have heard about today are things that we have to do. But we cannot get them through Congress. We cannot get them through the other body unless you are willing to support them.

□ 1345

So far, your response to everything has been "no." And you have this pie-in-the-sky that we are going to invent a 100-mile-per-gallon carburetor and all of a sudden our problems are going to go away. They were talking about that the last time we had an energy crisis under Jimmy Carter, and it never happened.

I know, somebody bought the patent to that carburetor and it is hidden away in a safe somewhere. Well, you know, your arguments hold about as much water now as they did 30 years ago when you started making them.

We need to develop energy here at home. That involves more fossil fuels, because that is what powers our Nation. But it also involves renewable energy, and it involves alternatives. You have got to come up with something better than "no."

Right now gas in my district is almost \$3.50 a gallon. We need to do something about providing energy here at home. You can't continue to say "no" on everything.

I encourage my colleagues to finally step up and begin to pass a domestic energy policy that creates energy here at home. ANWR is the first step in that. We will have the opportunity to continue to vote on new technology and new renewable resource issues, and we will see how many of you will step up to the plate and actually vote for the things that today you are saying you are in favor of, because your past history has shown you are not going to vote for it.

So as your constituents continue to pay more for gasoline and more for electricity and more for products because the cost of energy has gone up, as they continue to lose their jobs because the cost of natural gas has gone up, at what point will you step up and say "yes" to something?

Support the underlying bill.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

America's natural resources are diminishing daily. Places like Fossil Rim Wildlife Center just outside of Dallas, with its 1800 acres of unspoiled natural beauty and endangered Texas Prairie Chickens, need the support and protection of Congress.

Defending our natural resources is our responsibility as Federal representatives. All Americans benefit from unspoiled lands, clear skies, and wild places to enjoy.

Drilling the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is not the answer to our oil crisis. That strategy is not forward-thinking and won't sustain our energy needs for very long.

What we need instead are greater investments in energy efficiency and alternative fuels.

Mr. Speaker, I have consistently opposed ANWR drilling and I will oppose ANWR drilling again this time around.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my support for the American-Made Energy and Good Jobs Act, H.R. 5429. When Congress put a similar bill on then-President Clinton's desk in 1996, he vetoed that bill arguing it wasn't needed because if we opened up ANWR for oil and gas development, it would take 10 years for oil and gas to start flowing to Americans from ANWR. Today it is 2006—10 years after President Clinton's veto and 10 years of Senate filibusters. American consumers could certainly benefit today from the 1 million barrels per day that would be flowing from ANWR had we moved forward with oil and gas development in ANWR in 1996.

Oil and gas prices continue to rise and our dependence upon foreign sources of oil is at an all time high. If we are really serious and realistic about economic and national security, we must approve this bill and reduce our dependence on foreign energy sources.

Contrary to the many myths that have clouded this debate over the years, we have the technology and know-how to safely produce energy in ANWR with minimal intrusion into the surrounding environment. Safe and successful oil drilling on wildlife refuges is not idle speculation. We know it's possible because we have done it time and time again. According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Government Accountability Office, over 30 refuges currently have oil and gas wells on them without incident. Since the 1970s, for instance, there's been drilling in Prudhoe Bay—just 80 miles east of ANWR. Porcupine Caribou herds and other wildlife still roam freely there and in numbers greater than before there was drilling in the area. And it's important to note that the technology involved in ANWR drilling will far surpass what has been successfully used in the past.

Since oil and gas can be safely produced in ANWR, we must ask ourselves why we continue to ignore an easily accessible source of energy even as the price for oil hovers near \$60 a barrel, American consumers are paying \$3 a gallon for gasoline, and the increasing costs of natural gas is driving electric utility bills significantly higher each year.

This is particularly concerning given our growing dependence upon foreign sources of oil from countries and regions that are increasingly volatile. In 1982, the U.S. imported 32 percent of its oil. Today, that figure has grown to 56 percent. Unless we expand domestic production, estimates indicate that by 2020 upwards of 65 percent of U.S. oil will come from foreign countries. It is irresponsible to stand idly by and allow the next generation of Americans to be so subjected to the whims of foreign governments.

Some have said that the amount of oil we might get from ANWR isn't enough to significantly impact our energy supply. Such assertions are baseless and fly in the face of the facts. ANWR's coastal plain is the single greatest onshore prospect for future oil and could increase our domestic production by 20 percent in years ahead. Moreover, recent estimates indicate that ANWR could safely provide one million barrels of oil per day—that's

roughly the daily number of barrels the U.S. imports from Saudi Arabia. To put this in perspective, oil from ANWR could fuel my home state of Florida—the 3rd most populous state—for 29 years. In short, ANWR's potential impact on our future energy supply is not insignificant, and could provide valuable oil supplies even as we continue to move forward developing alternative sources of energy.

Opening ANWR is at least 10 years overdue and it is a common sense approach to help meet our growing energy needs. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, once again, we have before us legislation to open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) to drilling.

My question is: What problem are we trying to solve?

If this is an attempt to lower gas prices, then this bill won't do the job. According to a July 2005 report of the non-partisan Energy Information Administration of the Department of Energy, Arctic oil will reduce the price of a gallon of gas by less than a penny.

If this is an attempt to lessen our dependence on foreign oil, then this bill is not the solution. Whether we drill in the Arctic or not, U.S. dependence on foreign oil is projected to grow. The simple fact is that the U.S. has less than 3 percent of the world's oil reserves yet our country is responsible for 25 percent of the world's annual petroleum consumption.

This bill will rip apart a 1.5-million-acre wildlife refuge for a 6 month supply of oil.

The proponents claim that the drilling will be limited to a mere 2,000 acre area. As a point of comparison, the 100-mile-long, 12-lane New Jersey turnpike covers 1,800 acres. That limitation applies only to where the drilling will occur, not to supporting infrastructure, including roads. In addition, no requirement exists for the 2,000 acres to be contiguous. Drilling stations can be spread throughout the refuge, dotting the landscape.

Mr. Speaker, we have other choices. Choices that will preserve sensitive wilderness areas, reduce air pollution, and end our dependence on Middle Eastern oil. We should be improving the fuel economy of cars and trucks, which stands at the same level today as it was 20 years ago. We have the technology today to raise the standard for automobiles by 10 percent over the next decade, saving 1.1 million barrels of oil per day and reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 85 million metric tons a year.

House Democrats developed an Innovation Agenda, which was introduced last November. In it, we proposed cutting petroleum-based fuels by rapidly expanding production and distribution of synthetic and bio-based fuels such as ethanol derived from cellulosic sources, and by deploying new engine technologies for fuel-flexible, hybrid, plug-in hybrid and biodiesel vehicles. This is not far-off technology. It is at hand, and if we promote it now, we can end our dependence on Middle Eastern oil in a decade and we can do it without drilling in the Arctic or other sensitive areas.

These are the steps we should be taking, not the destructive policies which this bill represents. I urge my colleagues to reject the bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, no one should be fooled by the inventive title of the legislation pending before the House today. The sponsor of this measure calls his bill the "American-Made Energy and Good Jobs Act." A better title would be the "Big Oil Give-Away and Accountability Evasion Act."

The plain truth is that what we have here is an old proposal dressed up with a fancy, new title. Since 1995, Congress has voted again and again on the question of whether or not to open up the Arctic Wildlife Refuge to oil drilling. Just last December, the Alaska Delegation tried to force drilling in ANWR through the Congress by attaching it in the dead of night to a must-pass defense bill. The Senate refused, and so here we are today debating yet another bill to turn the Arctic Refuge over to the oil companies.

Drilling in ANWR will not bring down gasoline prices—not today and not tomorrow. No one knows how much economically recoverable oil lies underneath the Refuge. We do know that even if the Refuge were opened to oil exploration tomorrow, it would take nearly a decade for any Arctic Refuge oil to reach the market. Even if the estimates of economically recoverable oil in ANWR panned out, oil from ANWR would account for only about 3 percent of domestic oil use in 2025.

Of the many actions we could be voting on today to help consumers at the pump, it speaks volumes that opening up the Refuge to oil drilling is the first choice of the Leadership of the House.

For the last 6 years, the Majority leadership and the President have set the energy policy for the United States. The Bush Administration unveiled its energy plan in 2001. Although over 95 percent of the recommendations in that plan have been implemented, our Nation still confronts sky-high gas prices, growing dependence on foreign sources of energy, and record profits for the oil industry. In 2005, the six largest oil companies reported \$110 billion in profits. These profits will likely set a new record this year. The Majority's philosophy is that what's good for ExxonMobile is good for American consumers, but we have learned that this is not the case.

So essentially what the House Leadership is offering the country is more of the same. If they were serious about dealing with energy, the Majority would schedule a debate and a vote on H.R. 4479, the Energy Consumer Relief Act, which would roll back billions of dollars in tax breaks, royalty holidays and subsidies to oil and gas companies and make that funding available to bring down home heating costs through the LIHEAP program, as well as provide relief from high energy costs to farmers and small businesses.

Yesterday, Representative VISCLOSKY sought to offer a far-sighted amendment to the Energy and Water bill to provide \$750 million to move the United States towards energy independence. This amendment would have made important investments in alternative energy, including ethanol and biofuels; renewable energy research and development, and energy efficiency. Yet, the Majority blocked the House from even considering this proposal.

I realize that the House will likely repeat its previous votes on this issue today, but I strongly encourage the House to take more meaningful action to deal with our country's energy problems soon.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, we can't drill our way to energy independence. Although this Nation is responsible for 25 percent of the world's oil demand, we own only 3 percent of the reserves.

Time and again we've debated opening ANWR to oil exploration. It fails every time because a majority knows it's as misguided an

idea as leading off our energy policy by rewarding \$16 billion worth of tax-breaks to oil companies.

Opening ANWR is not the silver bullet for lowering gas prices. We need to shift the focus from supply back toward reducing our demand. If we don't we'll remain at the mercy of Big Oil.

We must commit more toward conservation and research into renewable energy if we're going to achieve energy independence once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, we owe our constituents more than what appears to be a debate about reform. It's time that we deliver a policy that embraces real energy reform.

Mr. Speaker, we can simply do better.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, America is at a crossroads: We can either perpetuate our energy dependence on oil, or we can start taking the necessary steps to develop alternative and renewable energy sources, and wean our Nation off oil.

Sadly, Congress has failed to recognize the urgency of America's energy crisis and will vote today to allow drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Increased drilling for limited quantities of an unsustainable resource in the ANWR is not the answer to America's energy problems, and I oppose this short-sighted legislation.

We cannot depend on this "quick fix" to solve a calamity whose ramifications reach far beyond the gas pump. The Bush administration claims that tapping this oil reserve will cause prices to fall, but the simple reality is that it will take years before oil from the ANWR actually makes it to a barrel. Even then, there is not enough oil in the ANWR to reduce our dependence on foreign sources.

Instead, Congress must focus on promoting alternative fuels, clean energy technologies, fuel cells, micro turbines, hybrid (electric) engines and bio-fuels. California and the South Bay are extremely well-positioned to lead in developing these alternatives.

While renewable and alternative fuels are the future, the time to act is now. There is no reason to take a step backwards by drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the deceptively titled American-Made Energy & Good Jobs Act, H.R. 5429.

Is this the answer to high gas prices and our dependence on foreign oil? I think not.

The Department of Energy says drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge will do nothing to bring gas prices down. In fact, if we were to drill in this pristine wildlife sanctuary tomorrow, it would only lower gas prices by a penny per gallon and we would not even see the so-called savings for 20 years.

And, it will scarcely make a ripple on our dependence on foreign oil, nor will it increase our national security. Even by the most optimistic estimates, oil from the Refuge will never meet more than two percent of the energy needs in America.

Drilling in the Arctic Refuge should not be taken seriously as a band-aid for meeting our immediate or future energy needs.

Instead, we need to continue to use modern technology to make cars go farther on a gallon of gas; encourage the production and purchase of hybrid cars; develop innovative energy sources; and invest in clean energy.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to oppose H.R. 5429.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this bill.

It wasn't long ago that President Bush stood in this chamber and rightly said we need to end our addiction to oil. But instead of working to break our fossil-fuel habit, today the Republican leadership of the House today is calling for one more fix.

Instead of putting together a prescription that will treat the underlying problem, they are trying to get us to swallow their favorite nostrum of drilling on the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

That would be bad enough if what they are peddling was just a harmless placebo. But it is not only ineffective, it is harmful to many important resources and values.

Any doctor will admit that any drug can have side effects, and that writing a prescription involves weighing the potential benefits against the risks.

Here, we are being asked to take a chance that there is a significant amount of economically recoverable oil on the coastal plain. So, we first must decide what stakes we are willing to risk, and then weigh the odds.

The stakes are the coastal plain. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service says it "is critically important to the ecological integrity of the whole Arctic Refuge" which is "America's finest example of an intact, naturally functioning community of arctic/subarctic ecosystems." In fact, because of the abundance and variety of its wildlife, the refuge has been compared to Africa's Serengeti. This area is a habitat for caribou, polar bears, grizzly bears, snow geese, 135 species of migratory birds, eagles, wolves, sheep, and muskoxen.

And what are the odds? Well, as anyone in the oil business knows, unless a well is drilled it is impossible to say whether even the most promising location actually has oil or gas. But the best estimate of the potential of the coastal plain is by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). In 1998 they estimated that if the price of oil drops to less than \$16 per barrel (as it did a few years ago) there would be no economically recoverable oil in the coastal plain. At \$24 per barrel, USGS estimated there is a 95 percent chance of finding 1.9 billion barrels of economically recoverable oil in the refuge's coastal plain and a 50 percent chance of finding 5.3 billion barrels. And at today's prices, presumably the odds are better for economically recoverable amounts.

But when you compare that with the amount of oil America uses each day, it is clear that at best there is a chance of finding several months' supply of oil in the coastal plain.

On the other hand, there is one thing that is a 100 percent sure bet—drilling will change everything on the coastal plain forever. According to the Department of the Interior, oil and gas exploration and development in the Refuge would permanently and irreversibly: Destroy the unique wildland values of a world-class natural area; disrupt ecological and evolutionary processes in one of the most pristine conservation areas in the North American arctic; diminish the Refuge's scientific value as a benchmark for understanding these processes; damage the biological and ecological integrity of the entire Refuge.

I do not think we should take that bet. We do not need to trade one non-renewable resource—the wilderness qualities of the coastal plain—for non-renewable oil.

There are less-sensitive places where oil may be found. And there are even better alternatives as well, including steps to conserve energy and greater use of renewable resources such as solar and wind power.

For example, consider that two-thirds of our oil consumption is for transportation. Experts agree that fuel-efficiency standards for new cars and light trucks could feasibly be raised to more than 40 miles per gallon by 2010. That would save 10 times as much oil as would likely be extracted from the Arctic refuge over the next 30 years. It also would mean a net economic gain for consumers of \$69 billion over the life of the vehicles, according to a 1998 American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy study. And it would be accompanied by a reduction in carbon dioxide pollution of more than 450 million tons per year—about a quarter of the reductions needed for the United States to meet the emission reduction goals established by the Kyoto Protocol.

In short, when it comes to drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, I think that the stakes are too high and the odds are too long. I do not think we should gamble with the future of the refuge—especially since we have better options.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, some other speakers in this debate made statements about the legislative history of the current law that governs management of the coastal plain portion of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. I think those statements deserve a brief response.

As we all know, relevant current law says the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is off-limits to drilling, and that only Congress can change that.

That relevant law is the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act—often called “ANILCA” or just the Alaska Lands Act.

My father, Mo Udall, was the chief House sponsor of that legislation.

During the time I have served in Congress, there has been some discussion about the history of the Alaska Lands Act and how its authors might vote if they were still Members of this Committee. And in particular, there have been suggestions that my father, if he were voting with us today, would oppose this amendment and support opening the coastal plain to drilling.

That’s an interesting thought. Of course, all we really know is that if things were different, they would be different. But I think that claim is not based on history.

I think that my father fact would oppose this legislation, because the law as it stands represents a compromise between two positions.

On the one hand were those who opposed drilling on the coastal plain because they thought it should be left alone. That was my father’s view, and that was what was provided in the Udall-Anderson bill passed by the House.

On the other hand, there were then, as there are now, people who thought oil and gas exploration and development should be permitted on the coastal plain.

The final compromise required a special study of the area’s energy potential to be followed by a recommendation about whether Congress should open the area to drilling. And, in the meantime, no drilling was allowed.

This compromise was worked out in the Senate. It passed there and came over to the House in the summer of 1980 but the House did not act on it until after that year’s elections. Then, in a lame-duck session, my father moved that the House concur in the Senate-passed bill—which the House did, on a voice vote. That sent it to President Carter, who signed it into law on December 2, 1980.

I have no doubt that my father and the other House champions of the Alaska Lands Act considered the compromise the best that could be achieved at that time.

I also have no doubt that they considered it acceptable only because there would not be any drilling in the coastal plain unless and until Congress specifically approved it. My father did not support drilling there in 1980. I do not think he would support it now.

Of course, the real issue here isn’t what happened in the past, but what will happen in the refuge in the future. That is up to us—not our predecessors—to decide. And as we do so, we are deciding not just for ourselves but also—and more importantly—for our children and their children.

But if people do want to consider some words from the past, I would direct their attention to the Interior Committee’s original report on the Alaska Lands Act, dated April 7, 1978.

On page 149, the report points out that “the Committee has noted the eloquent statements of a number of prominent Alaskans” about the idea of building a pipeline across the coastal plain.

And the report quotes the words of the senior Senator from Alaska, who “told the Council on Environmental Quality that ‘Some have appropriately compared [that idea] with slicing a razor blade across the face of the Mona Lisa.’”

I am not saying that the senior Senator from Alaska would oppose this legislation—on the contrary, I know he supports it. But I think that years ago he aptly described what will happen if the coastal plain is opened to drilling, and why I oppose letting that happen.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, even President Bush admits that this country’s addiction to oil is a crisis, but, like a desperate junkie, the Republican Congress is frantically trying one more time to squeeze every last drop out of our pristine wilderness. Mr. POMBO’s bill—which won’t have any meaningful impact on oil prices and which has no chance of passing the Senate—is a tragic reminder that the Republican Majority has lost the will to seriously govern this country. Drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) is Republicans’ reflex to high gas prices in the same way that banning gay marriage is their reflex to a disgruntled conservative base, and tax cuts are their reflex to sagging poll numbers. In the 11 years Republicans have worked to open ANWR, they could have instead begun to wean America off its dependence on unsustainable energy sources.

The Bush Administration’s own studies show that any oil derived from ANWR would amount to about 3.9 billion barrels of economically recoverable oil—a six-month supply for the U.S. Once drilling has violated the area, however, the natural habitat that once existed will be permanently ruined.

ANWR is the largest undeveloped wilderness left in our country. This 19 million acre coastal plain has been called “America’s Serengeti” because of its abundance of car-

ibou, polar bears, grizzly bears, snow geese, 135 species of migratory birds, eagles, wolves, sheep, and musk oxen. To destroy this natural treasure for six months of oil would be unconscionable.

I urge my colleagues to reject this sham once and for all so that after 11 years of lost time, we can finally get serious about renewable energy.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the American Made Energy and Good Jobs Act.

Exploring for energy in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge would be a major step toward energy independence for America.

Energy markets are uncertain and American consumers feel the pinch at the pump whenever there is the slightest market disruption.

American families should not have to risk their energy future on the whims of foreign dictators, rebel forces, and regimes that do not have America’s interests in mind.

From Venezuela, to Nigeria, to Saudi Arabia, America continues to gamble its economic future through dependence on foreign oil. The time to stop this is now.

The way to stop this is by increasing domestic production of oil.

The Energy Information Administration estimates that ANWR is capable of producing more than 1.5 million barrels of oil a day, more than U.S. imports from Saudi Arabia, or Venezuela on any given day.

This effort should not stop with ANWR. We must also explore the reserves that lie off of our shores in the Outer Continental Shelf.

The only way to secure our energy future is to utilize the resources we have here at home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 835, the bill is considered read and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. GEORGE MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am, in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. George Miller of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5429 to the Committee on Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of section 4(a) (page 7, line 23), insert the following: “For purposes of this subsection, a person shall not be treated as qualified to obtain such a lease if such person is a lessee under an existing lease issued by the Department of the Interior pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Deep Water Royalty Relief Act (43 U.S.C. 1337 note) that is not subject to limitations on royalty relief based on market price.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment to make sure that the taxpayers of this country and the owners of the Federal lands are not shortchanged if in fact ANWR will be opened in the future. Last week we discussed royalty relief, and we made the point that there are companies who have a royalty holiday. They do not pay royalties to the taxpayers of this country for the drilling on the lands that are owned by those taxpayers. In some cases, those companies may be able to escape almost all of the royalties on those lands.

We are simply saying to the Secretary of the Interior, if ANWR is opened, whether you are for it or against it, if ANWR is opened, those companies that continue to exploit the royalty holiday will not be allowed to bid for a lease in the ANWR, should it be leased. This is only fair to the taxpayers. An overwhelming bipartisan coalition voted for this last week on legislation. We seek to have that vote again to make sure.

We all know that oil is at \$70 a barrel. We know oil company profits are at record all-time highs. Yet nobody can figure out how to give the taxpayer a break.

The oil companies are not going to lower the price of gas or pay for the research in the bill yesterday, and now they are telling us they won't give back the royalty holiday that they are not entitled to. They are going to continue to exploit this loophole in the law, and then they want to bid on new resources. We simply say, enough is enough. We want to protect the taxpayers.

This is not about whether ANWR is open or whether ANWR remains closed; this is about the ethics and this is about the judgment of this Congress in dealing with these oil companies that seek to not only have their cake and eat it too, but to move on and get new cake from the taxpayers of this country.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, this recommittal motion goes right to the heart of what the Congress voted last week. Last week the Congress said that if oil companies that had received leases in the 1990s and in the early part of this century that are not paying any royalties on the oil which they drill out of public lands that would help to reduce the deficit, to pay for Medicare, to pay for Medicaid; if they are not going to pay royalties at \$60 a barrel, \$70 a barrel, \$80 a barrel, \$90 a barrel or \$100 a barrel on oil which is drilled on public lands that they already have leases on, that those companies should not be able to drill on public lands in an Arctic wildlife refuge and receive the benefit of drilling on public lands.

Either they renegotiate their old royalty agreements with the Federal Government that allow them to escape paying to the Federal Treasury, or

they will not get the benefit of drilling on public lands, especially if it is a wildlife refuge.

So that is what this is all about. And President Bush said in April there is no need for royalty relief at \$55 a barrel oil. We are talking about \$60, \$70, \$80, \$90 a barrel. This recommittal motion ensures that the American taxpayer will be protected.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, last week on the Hinchey amendment, where this issue was as straightforward as it is today, 67 Republicans joined 184 Democrats and overwhelmingly passed this amendment.

This amendment is a matter of simple fairness and equity, and it is to make sure that those people at these times of record profits who seek to exploit the loopholes in the law are not allowed to do that and get new leases from the taxpayers of this country in ANWR. That is simple fairness, it is simple equity, and the people of this country are entitled to it.

I would urge people to support the motion to recommit, and then the bill will go forward and people can decide on whether or not they want to drill in ANWR. I hope they don't, or, if they want to not do that, I hope they will make that decision. But that is independent of this fairness to the taxpayers, to the ratepayers, to the property owners in this country who own these lands that will be put out to bid, that we don't get fleeced twice by a couple of the oil companies that think they can have it both ways.

Mr. POMBO. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POMBO. Madam Speaker, I do agree with one thing that my colleague and neighbor from California said, which is that this motion to recommit has absolutely nothing to do with ANWR, because it has absolutely nothing to do with ANWR. It is, again, a cynical attempt to try to kill the bill.

While I have to share his concerns over a so-called mistake that was made by the Clinton administration, that they forgot to put price triggers in when they were signing multiple leases with oil companies, they somehow forgot to put in those triggers that said when oil did reach \$55 a barrel that they wouldn't get royalty relief anymore. In the bill that they are trying to recommit, there is no royalty relief in the bill.

Again, the motion to recommit has absolutely nothing to do with the bill that they are trying to recommit.

What does concern me is that at this point, trying to kill the chance of creating 250,000 to 750,000 new American jobs, somehow that is okay for political gain, I imagine. It kills the chance to increase the amount of money to our Treasury by CRS' estimate of between \$111 billion and \$170 billion,

which far exceeds any royalties they would collect under this scheme that they have cooked up. It kills the chance to lower our dependence on foreign oil.

As I said in my closing, at some point they have to say "yes." At some point you have to say "yes" to new American energy. At some point you have to be for something. Being against everything is not an energy policy.

A cynical attempt to try to kill this bill again is not going to win this time. It hasn't won the 11 times before this, and it is not going to carry this time.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the motion to recommit and to support the underlying bill.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the order of the House of today, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5441, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 836 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 836

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. 5441) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, 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: beginning with the comma on page 38, line 11 through "funds" on line 14; section 512; beginning with "or" on page 54, line 12 through "appropriation" on line 13; and section 536. Where points of order are waived against part of a paragraph or section, points of order against a provision in another part of such paragraph or section may be made only against such provision and not against the entire paragraph or section. 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.

□ 1400

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

Madam Speaker, the resolution before us today is a fair and completely open rule that provides 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 and provides under the rules of the House that the bill shall be read for amendment by paragraph. The rule waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI, except as specified in the resolution. It authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Finally, as always, the rule provides the minority with one motion to recommit the legislation with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying legislation. This bill sponsored by my friend from Kentucky, the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security, Mr. ROGERS, provides the funding needed to help secure our Nation's borders and revitalize immigration enforcement, enhance port security, support our first responders and empower them to effectively deal with disasters while also providing the fiscal discipline and oversight needed to ensure the Department is accomplishing its mission as effectively and efficiently as possible.

This legislation provides for a total of over \$32 billion for the critical domestic and defense activities of the Department of Homeland Security. This funding is balanced along with an array of Federal programs that will ensure our Nation against terrorist attacks, including critical antiterrorism and border security activities, as well as emerging threats like nuclear detection and enhanced port container and cargo security.

This legislation provides nearly \$20 billion for immigration enforcement and border security, including over \$2.3

billion for border security, which will add 1,200 new Border Patrol agents for a total of 13,500 agents authorized as overall agents.

Over \$4 billion for immigration and customs enforcement, which will add 1,212 new officers for a total of 11,500 overall agents. And \$115 million for border security technology and tactical infrastructure.

Additionally, this bill allocates increased funding for Customs and Border Patrol air interdiction operations, maintenance and procurement. Last year the Department consolidated the Office of Border Patrol Air and Marine Assets with the Office of Air and Marine Operations in the newly formed CBP Air.

In 2004 and again last year, in 2005, I visited San Angelo, Texas, to witness firsthand how our air assets were being used to secure our southern borders and to prevent illegal drugs from entering this country.

Since then, I have strongly supported the balanced multimission AMO strategy of pushing out the border to combat illegal immigration, narcotics trafficking and smuggling of other illegal cargoes. I believe that a vigorous coordinated Department of Homeland Security air program is essential to our national security, and I continue to work closely with our Members, including MARCIA BLACKBURN, Chairman ROGERS, Chairman PETER KING, Chairman MARK SOUDER, JOHN SWEENEY and others to ensure that multi-mission strategy be maintained.

It is interesting to note that this agency has taken the plan that they have initiated and are bringing it forward at this time to make sure that this Congress is aware of what their new strategy is as a result of this realignment. I applaud CBP Air's efforts to achieve greater operation and cost efficiencies; however, a multi-mission CBP Air is vital to a comprehensive border security strategy.

I am very pleased that this legislation details that this expectation, that while CBP Air continues to secure our border, this important function cannot come at the expense of other critical Homeland Security missions, and I will continue to work with Chairman ROGERS to ensure that CBP Air follows through with the committee's recommendations.

Aside from these important border security and immigration enforcement functions, this legislation also addresses many other integral national security functions building upon the successes of recently passed legislation, this legislation provides funding over last year's level to secure our ports and in-bound cargo to prevent terrorists and criminals from exploiting the international commerce system.

It provides funding for Coast Guard port and water way security operations; funding for CBP Air cargo inspection and trade operations needed to implement the House's recently passed port security legislation; the

funding needed to double the amount of cargo currently inspected; screening 100 percent of cargo through the Automated Targeting System; and to establish minimum security standards for cargo containers

Chairman HAL ROGERS has addressed these needs for our first responders by providing over \$3 billion to ensure their readiness. Since September 11, including the funds in this bill almost \$37.5 billion has been provided to first responders for terrorism prevention and preparedness, law enforcement fire fighter assistance, airport security, sea port security and public health preparedness.

Finally, this legislation provides the oversight and Congressional guidance that the Department of Homeland Security needs to accomplish its mission effectively in areas such as port and container security, border security and immigration enforcement, first responder grants, air cargo and transportation security and disaster management preparation.

Chairman ROGERS has included provisions to withhold funds to ensure that the Department of Homeland Security complies with these Congressional dictates and direction. I want to commend Chairman ROGERS and others on his committee, including ZACK WAMP, TOM LATHAM, JO ANN EMERSON, JOHN SWEENEY, JIM KOLBE, ERNEST ISTOOK, ANDER CRENSHAW, JOHN CARTER and TOM DELAY for their hard work and for working with me in the preparation of this important bill as we bring this bill to the floor.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, there is a difference between real security and rhetorical security. Today it is easy to see which one the Congress is committed to. We received what was perhaps the greatest wake-up call in the Nation's history on September 11, 2001.

And the failure of our national security personnel on that day should have been the catalyst for an unprecedented strengthening of our system. But in ways that mattered most, it did not happen. In more than 4 years, this Congress has failed to properly fund the Nation's first responders in spite of their historic and heroic performance on that terrible day.

In fact, the year's funding levels are \$100 million less than last year's. In 4 years, Congress has also failed to secure the Nation's chemical plants. Over 300 plants nationwide, each with a capacity to kill 50,000 or more people if they were attacked, are left with security un-upgraded.

What many experts consider the single greatest vulnerability to our security today, our ports, has not been addressed; 5 years after 9/11, 95 percent of

cargo can containers that pass through our ports are never inspected in any way. And after all we have heard lately about border security, the Congress has refused to pay for the border agents or detention facilities needed to enforce the immigration laws that we pass.

Madam Speaker, while I speak of the failings of Congress to invest in real security for our people, it is critical to remember which party has been in charge since 2001. Since that time, Democrats have tried again and again to get our Republican colleagues to back up their words with actions.

We have authored numerous amendments to increase funding for critical and essential national security programs. This year we presented an amendment to provide an additional \$3.5 billion for border, port aviation and disaster preparedness programs. And I understand that for \$1.5 billion, we could give every port on earth the ability to check cargo.

The Democrats wanted to pass funding that would support 1,800 new Border Patrol agents, more than the 800 more immigration investigators and 9,000 new detention beds. We authored legislation to fund 500 new radiation monitors to inspect cargo and increase funding for public transportation by two-thirds.

And it was a Democratic bill that would have given our first responders \$600 million more with which to protect themselves as citizens of the country. All of these amendments were rejected by Republican-controlled committees.

Now, at the same time, the actions of government agencies that we trust to defend us raise serious questions about their competency and compassion to protect this Nation. And I must talk about what they have done over in Homeland Security in regard to the Shirlington Limousine contract.

As you know, 2 years ago, they were given an unbid contract of \$3.5 million to chauffeur around people who work for DHS in Washington, despite the fact that, I am certain, they have fleets of cars, as every other agency does, and how cheap it would have been for them to take a taxi. But that was not enough.

A year later, they awarded a \$21 million contract to the same company, bid this time. They were not the low bidder, but they did get the contract. Now let me tell you that if the first responders and the officials up in my part of the country can get their hands on \$21 million to fortify the borders, they would do it in a New York minute.

Shirlington, when it was given these contracts, was nearly bankrupt. It had recently been fired by a local university for poor performance, and its president is a convicted felon. No background checks of any kind were done by the Department of Homeland Security.

Now, the company is now involved in an ongoing Federal investigation, along with several unnamed Members

of this body, which has so far revealed that it may have literally provided the vehicles by which an illegal influence peddling ring operated.

I have submitted a resolution of inquiry to the Homeland Security Committee which would compel DHS to turn over all documents related to the awarding of their contract to Shirlington. No hearing has been held; basically no questions have been raised.

After all, the American people have a right to know how a corrupt and dubious company received a huge contract with our Homeland Security money and who, if anyone, interceded on its behalf. It takes the wonderment of Alice in Wonderland believing six impossible things before breakfast to believe that someone in that agency did not grease the skids for that company.

But DHS has so far refused our requests for information. We do not even have a response. And the Republican Congress refused to force them to turn over that information, and I want to know why.

Nor is this the only way in which DHS, the supposed cure for the problems that permitted September 11 to take place, has yet to prove itself to be a valuable agency. Frankly, its value is very dubious.

My constituents in the northern United States have experienced such a reality first hand. In January 2008, Homeland Security and the State Department intend to introduce new forms of border identification for northern residents as part of the Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative. The plan itself is deeply flawed. It will result in a dramatic reduction in cross border travel and trade and one that will cost the national economies of the United States and Canada billions of dollars every year.

And at a recent meeting that we had with members of the Canadian parliament, they asked the question that is very pertinent: What does Canada do with the citizens of the United States who have gone to Canada and do not have a passport to allow themselves to come home?

Is the Canadian government expected to take all of these American citizens into custody and to hold them? On what grounds? And to what end? I suggested at the Rules Committee that maybe we could send the Shirlington Limousine up to Canada and bring them home.

But what is worse, it faces opposition, not just from outside the government but within it as well. Just yesterday, the DHS privacy office released a draft report stating that elements of the plan raised both security and privacy concerns.

□ 1415

The GAO will soon report that both DHS and State are nowhere near being able to implement the plan by their January 2008 deadline. In fact, what is really astonishing is there is not a

dime in this bill concerning WHTI, anything for infrastructure, anything that they plan to spend money on, which says to me that DHS knows itself that they are not ever going to be able to do this.

When we step back and take all of these things together, we know what is occurring in Washington. Despite all of its pledges and promises, the Republican-led Congress has failed to make us safer. It has not spent the money needed to improve the vulnerable parts of our national security system, but wastes it on limousine service. Its own agencies have proven incapable of coordinating their activities or implementing new security plans. And the corruption of Congress has seeped into and affected some of those we count on to protect us, all under the nose of a House entirely uninterested in any kind of oversight.

Madam Speaker, the American people have had enough of these priorities of agencies that this government presides over. They know the difference between real security that the Democratic Party is offering and unfulfilled promises of the majority party. They deserve a leadership that shares their priorities, that will not break its own promises. They deserve a change.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, this Congress I think has done a great job under the leadership of not only Hal Rogers but also Chairman PETER KING in making sure that we are involved in a collaborative effort with the administration. There have been a number of things that we have seen differently than the administration, but there are a huge number of areas that we have worked together with this administration.

I am very proud of the leadership of this House on a bipartisan basis to address the issues, whether it is dealing with ports, whether it is dealing with our borders, or whether it is dealing with the individual processes that take place in trying to make sure that this Department runs on a better basis.

It is a big task that was undertaken by Homeland Security. It was a big task undertaken a couple of years ago. We know, all of us Members of Congress, that not everything has gone right. That is why we are doing this bill today. We are trying to make sure that we are addressing those things which have not worked as well, but we are also perhaps more importantly trying to put things into a perspective of funding those activities that we think that are important, providing the necessary money but with a strong sense of oversight to make sure this administration understands that while we are giving this money to them on behalf of the taxpayer, they accept it knowing that they have a duty and a responsibility, that we have a collaborative effort.

So I am proud of our oversight. I am proud of the things we are doing and

working on a bipartisan basis on homeland security, and I am proud of what this bill is all about.

A prime example I will give you is a man, MIKE CONAWAY from Midland, Texas. Congressman CONAWAY has within his congressional district something I spoke about earlier, CBP Air, Customs and Border Protection Air. They are responsible for air interdiction programs. Congressman CONAWAY has been intimately involved in working with them to make sure that they have the necessary resources for looking over the horizon of those planes and other activities that may be associated with drugs coming into this country.

He has taken it by himself as a lead because it was an area within his congressional district, to make sure that he listened to the men and women, to pat them on the back in San Angelo, Texas, for the hard work they have done, to make sure the coordination and talking with them about the expectation of this Congress and the American people was done.

So I am pleased and can stand here before you today, Madam Speaker, to say this bill is important. This bill is a collaborative effort. This bill is bipartisan. This bill is something that many, many Members have had a huge part of working on and making sure that we are doing those things that prepare this country and continue to keep us prepared. But more importantly, we have had to put them in a priority basis. That is what this document is all about.

We will continue to work with this administration to make sure that homeland security is something that works for the security of this country.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

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

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, the security of our Nation is this institution's highest priority. Therefore, I was pleased to see that overall funding for homeland security was increased. This includes an increase for our security efforts at our ports, borders, critical infrastructure, and all modes of transportation. There is also increased funding for our brave State and local first responders.

This bill, however, still falls short because it is controlled by limited resources rather than need. The allocation isn't high enough; and, therefore, our security is compromised as a result.

For example, the Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program grants which are very important to local police response capabilities. These are funds my own hometown of Sacramento has received and used for

things like information analysis. Unfortunately, the administration zeroed out its funding. Wisely, the committee recognized the value of this program and restored its funds. But to do so they had to move funds from the Urban Area Security Initiative grant known as UASI, to the Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program grant.

In Sacramento, UASI funding has proven vital. Funds have been spent on such items such as gas mask filters, first responder training and communication equipment upgrades; but earlier this year, the guidelines changed. Sacramento, along with a number of other cities, was deemed ineligible to apply. Yet in all of my meetings and letters with DHS and the White House, the only plausible explanation I walked away with is that budgetary constraints necessitated this change.

Both of these programs provide critical resources to our communities, but to ensure preparedness we are left robbing Peter to pay Paul. DHS's core mission is to secure the safety of Americans. It is Congress's responsibility to ensure that their efforts are adequately funded. However, Democratic attempts to boost funding by \$3.5 billion for border security, port security, aviation security, first responders, and disaster preparedness were defeated.

I have an obligation to ensure that we are meeting our national security needs and a responsibility to my constituents. I am glad that this bill does increase funding. I hope that will continue to address all of our security funding needs.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the Rules Committee from California for her words. I do understand that many people on her side of the aisle want to spend more money. That is a natural tendency: spend more money. Make sure my district is protected. Give money to me. Make sure all of these things are taken care of back home. And I share that same concern. I share that concern because we really do see need around our community.

However, with that said, there had to be decisions made that were on a priority basis. And we have learned a lot over the last few years about where the threats are and how money can and must be spent more efficiently and effectively.

I want the gentlewoman to know that I do believe that her attempts to secure money for her first responders are big needs back where she is from, but there are 435 of us who see it that same way also about the needs of our districts. And that is why this committee has worked very carefully with the authorizing committee to make sure that the money that we spend is on a need basis based upon the threats of this country.

So I admire the gentlewoman, Ms. MATSUI, for her comments. I want her to know that it is a continuing process, and we will learn things as we move

forward, and this bill is necessary for us to prioritize. That is what the Republican majority needed to do in this bill, and that is what we have done. And then along the way we have said "no" to a lot of our own Members also based upon the priority that is necessary to ensure the security and the safety of the entire Nation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say that it is not that we want to spend more money. We really question the way money is spent, and we really believe that \$21 million to drive people around town is an absurd expense for an agency that is responsible for our safety.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO).

Mr. SABO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I commend the Rules Committee for producing a rule that is much improved over last year, with one big exception. I am very disappointed that this rule fails to protect section 536, chemical security provisions, which I added to the bill in the Appropriations Committee.

Nearly 5 years after 9/11, the vast majority of chemical facilities in this country are not properly secured. They are prime targets for a catastrophic terrorist attack. Yet there is precious little being done to protect them. The administration acknowledges this problem, but says it cannot act without new legal authority to make and enforce chemical security regulations.

The Congress for more than four years has failed to act. Competing legislation in the House and the Senate authorizing committees has gone nowhere. What are we waiting for? Section 536 would end the stalemate. These provisions would give DHS the legal authority that Secretary Chertoff says he needs to regulate security at U.S. chemical facilities that pose the greatest risk to Americans.

In 2002, Congress addressed a small part of the chemical security problem. I see Congressman YOUNG on the floor and I congratulate him because the security requirements of chemical facilities on ports under the Maritime Transportation Security Act and the Coast Guard are doing a good job of enforcing them.

Under the Bioterrorism Act of 2002, the EPA also oversees security at the Nation's drinking water facilities. The problem is there are thousands of other chemical plants and storage facility without Federal security standards or oversight. An attack on one of them has the potential to kill or injure tens of thousands of people.

DHS has said that 20 percent of the 3,400 chemical facilities it identifies as "high risk" adhere to no security guidelines. If section 536 is stricken from this bill, Congress will appear content to leave security at these facilities to the conscience of their operators.

To my friends who would strike 536, I say, what do we have to lose by keeping this language in the bill? If before the end of this Congress the authorizing committees can act and the President signs chemical security legislation into law, then section 536 will be unnecessary. However, I have my doubts that will happen.

If section 536 is struck from this bill, I suspect that another Congress will adjourn without acting on chemical security. And then where will we be? We will go another year without security requirements at the Nation's highest-risk chemical sites. The American people waited too long for Congress to take responsible action to prevent a catastrophic attack on a chemical facility. I urge my colleagues to refrain from making a point of order against the chemical security provisions in this bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I do appreciate and respect the gentleman who will be retiring this year, Mr. SABO, who appeared in the Rules Committee yesterday to provide not only feedback related to this bill and his thoughts and ideas but also to recommend additional points of consideration.

The gentleman has once again appeared on the floor of the House. The gentleman is aware that this would be the equivalent of legislating on appropriations. And thus the gentleman, Mr. KING, chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, has sent a letter to Chairman DREIER, the chairman of the Rules Committee, indicating that he preferred that this section 536 not be included within the rule or protected as a result of the committee deciding that it will have comprehensive hearings on this matter to develop legislation rather than what Mr. SABO's legislation tends to do, but rather comprehensive, overall way to look at these high-security risks as it relates to these facilities.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, May 23, 2006.

Hon. DAVID DREIER,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DREIER: The Committee on Appropriations recently ordered H.R. 5441, the Homeland Security Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2007, reported to the House. This measure contains a number of provisions that violate House rule XXI, clause 2, which prohibits legislation in a general appropriation bill. Included below is an explanation of a legislative provision within the primary jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security that appears in the Bill, and I respectfully request that you not protect this provision from points of order on the Floor.

Section 536 (page 62, lines 1-17), adopted as an amendment offered by Congressman Martin Sabo at Full Committee markup, requires the Department of Homeland Security to issue security requirements for chemical facilities that the Department deems to have the highest risk within six months of enactment of the bill. The Committee on Homeland Security is actively engaged in developing comprehensive legislation to address the issue of chemical site security, and the

Sabo Amendment would undermine the Committee's efforts to provide common-sense, risk-based solutions to this problem.

If you have questions regarding this request, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

PETER T. KING,
Chairman.

□ 1430

Madam Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), the vice chairman of the Republican Conference.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank Mr. SESSIONS for yielding to me, and, Madam Speaker, I wanted to talk about two elements of this bill that I hope we will have a chance to vote on, and I hope they will be ruled germane to the bill.

One of them is the Nathan Deal amendment that has to do with birthright citizenship: 122 countries right now do not allow birthright citizenship. Only 36 do, and many of those countries have the advantage of no one wants to go into their country and migrate there.

But the policy in America is so liberal now that if you are flying over America in an airplane, regardless of your destination or your origination, if that plane crosses the south tip of Florida and you are born, you become an American citizen, and as an American citizen, as an anchor baby, you can turn around and petition to have the rest of your family come into the country, and you are given a higher priority.

The Center for Immigration Studies estimates that 42 percent of births to immigrants are to illegal aliens. The birth of illegal aliens right now accounts for one out of every 10 births in the United States of America. Depending on who you talk to, the cost of this may be as high as \$10 billion a year to American taxpayers.

We know in the State of Georgia that we spend \$58 million a year on emergency medical services for illegal aliens. No one is arguing about spending that on emergency medical costs right now. We are saying, okay, with that, but what we are saying is, you should not become an American citizen just because your mama broke the law to get here and have you born. We want to give you the medical costs but not everything else.

What the Deal amendment does is it does away with birthright citizenship in the United States of America. It is a bill that has a lot of cosponsors. I believe it is a bipartisan bill, and we want to attach it to the homeland security bill as we see a runaway, broken down immigration policy part of our national security picture.

Indeed, many of the immigrants who are coming over from Mexico, legal and illegal, are, in fact, non-Mexican citizens, and in many cases, they are caught and released into the country with hopes that they may or may not come back. I guess they may come back, but many times, they do not.

That is why I am standing in support of the Deal amendment.

I also have an amendment that I have offered, and what my amendment does is it is a payment limitation amendment because our own Border Patrol apparently is tipping off the Mexican government as to where Minutemen are on the Mexico-United States border.

Currently, we have 7,000 volunteers in the Minutemen organization. I say volunteers. These are unpaid people who are so outraged with the runaway illegal immigration problem that they have set up posts along the southwest border to help the Border Patrol and the local law enforcement agencies to tell them where the people are coming in and who is coming in.

I invite all Members of Congress to go to the southwest border sometime this summer and take a look at how outrageous and how out of control this problem is.

But despite the good work of the Minutemen organization, we find that our own Border Patrol now has a policy of tipping off the Mexican government so that they can inform these illegal aliens, these lawbreakers, as to where the lawful American citizens are located.

What our amendment does is says that none of our money appropriated in this bill can be spent to tip off people who are breaking the law as to where law-abiding citizens are who are trying to help border security; do not tip them off.

The Minutemen is one of these kind of politically incorrect organizations which the eastern Washingtonian, big government establishment likes to pooh-poo, put down as being a bunch of country rednecks who are reactionaries who really just want to shoot people coming over the border. That is absolutely not the case. They are 7,000 volunteers who are good, hard-working American taxpaying citizens, who are really trying to help out and help preserve the security of the country they love, and for our own Border Patrol to be undermining them, when the Border Patrol is not doing sufficient work to begin with, is counter-productive.

So I hope that our amendment is in order and that we do get an overwhelming bipartisan support on it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, we reserve the balance of our time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for the time.

Madam Speaker, we have a bill here with which I cannot argue in terms of the allocation of resources within the total dollar amount assigned to the subcommittee, but I can argue with the overall total because I think, despite the fact that the chairman and ranking member have tried as hard as possible to put money where you will get the biggest bang for a buck, the fact is, we

do not have enough bucks in here to get enough of a bang to really protect the country.

We tried to do something about that in committee, and I would like to describe what some of the provisions were that we wanted to change.

We essentially tried to add \$3.5 billion in committee for key Homeland Security actions, border protection, harbor protection, port protection and all the rest, and we did it in a fiscally responsible way, because what we suggested was that we simply reduce the amount of the tax cut for persons making over \$1 million a year by about \$10,000, which would mean that those persons making \$1 million, instead of getting on average a \$114,000 tax cut this year, would only get a \$104,000 tax cut. The poor devils just would have to scrape along on that amount. I think the country needs added homeland security, much more than millionaires need a supersized tax cut.

Let me tell you what some of the items were that we would fund with that money. We wanted to add 1,800 additional Border Patrol agents, and we wanted to add 9,000 additional detention beds. We wanted to provide increased funding to meet all of the Intelligence Reform Act mandates for increased Border Patrol agents, increased immigration investigators and increased detention bed spaces.

We also wanted to increase our border detention capabilities, and we wanted to provide for additional air patrol and operating hours and cut in half the number of unfunded radiation portal monitors. We also wanted to replace older Border Patrol vehicles and expand border facilities.

We wanted to provide additional funding for Customs and Border Protection and the Coast Guard to expand the number of overseas ports that are monitored. We wanted to provide for an updating of flood maps in critical high-risk areas, and so on and so on.

I know there are those in this House on the majority side who say, you should not try to link taxes with spending; those are two separate issues. The fact is that every dollar of tax cuts provided, in tax cuts that the Congress passed just 2 weeks ago, comes at the expense of programs like this, programs to strengthen border security, whether it is on the Mexican or the Canadian border, programs to strengthen our ability of local law enforcement officials to have interoperable equipment so that they are speaking to each other on the same frequency.

I think while a good many Members of this chamber do not like the fact that we keep dredging this up, the fact is, this is the most important priority choice the Congress will make. I really do not believe that the average taxpayer thinks that we should accept less effective immigration enforcement, less effective border control in order to provide another supersized tax cut for people who are already the most well-off people in this society.

I think the country as a whole would be far more strengthened by some of the items that we have talked about here than they would be by such tax cuts, and that is why I will be voting against the previous question on the rule and the rule itself in order to protest the fact that we are not able to actually vote on these specific tradeoffs.

The Budget Act was meant to force Congress to make tradeoffs between spending and revenues. In fact, the way the Budget Act is being managed by the leadership of this House, those tradeoffs are being avoided. We should not do that in what is supposed to be the greatest deliberative legislative body in the world.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I respect and appreciate the gentleman from Wisconsin for coming to the floor. Just as he did yesterday in the Rules Committee, he asked for us to spend more money, told us about priorities that were not funded properly, wants to get the money by raising taxes, wants to make sure that we know that the priorities should be done differently, and that I respect.

It is no surprise to anybody that the Democrat party sees things differently than we do about how you focus on the priorities of this Nation to ensure our security and our safety. I am worried about their plan. I have worried about their plan because I know that what they want to do is raise taxes. I know what they want to do; they want to spend more money.

Yet, I have only been in this House for some 10 years, and I remember, year after year after year, all they did was take money from the Border Patrol. Year after year after year, they took money from the CIA. Year after year after year, they took money out of the military. Then, all of a sudden, there are problems; they want to know, golly, why can we not get more money to fund the priorities of this Nation?

We are trying to balance what we are doing. I will confess to you that I am not as happy about how much money we are spending or not spending also, but we are trying to move things through on a process basis. That is where HAL ROGERS and PETE KING, the chairmen of these Republican committees, are doing a good job to balance that money that is available within the parameters of the budget assignment that has been given to this Congress.

So we are going to keep doing it, and we are going to keep struggling, and I thank the gentleman for coming forward. I hope he comes forward with all the spending bills, and I would be disappointed if he did not disagree with us. But I think the answer every time just about, spending more money and raising taxes in this country is not the answer but, rather, a priority basis where we are trying to aim at the threat against this country where homeland security is, and I think this is a balanced bill and I am proud of what we are doing.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of our time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I do not think the American people are going to buy it anymore that Democrats are great spendthrifts and just want to throw more money. We would not do a contract for \$21 million for a limousine to drive around Washington.

I think people remember that, 6 years ago, we had the largest surplus that this country has ever enjoyed that should have lasted us for 20 years. It lasted less than three, and now we have the largest deficit we have ever had.

I think people will see through that. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this bill, and I could not agree with what she said more.

Our friend from Texas talked about a clash of priorities. It is not just about spending money. When you are giving a new tax break to those in this country who need it less, that is draining money from the Treasury.

What Mr. OBEY talked about was dealing with priorities for our Nation's security. You have made a judgment that it is more important for a few to have a massive tax decrease as opposed to dealing meaningfully with security needs, and I will venture that the American public, given those two, would have no difficulty in agreeing with Mr. OBEY. One is sad that we are not at least having a chance to vote on it today.

□ 1445

I will say that there are parts of this bill that I feel good about. One of the things that I have been working very hard on deals with efforts to contend with prevention measures to reduce the damage done by floods and other natural disasters. This bill deals with funding critical elements for the safety and security of the American public.

We think often of things like terrorism and border security, but in fact more people's lives are lost, more damage is incurred by natural disaster. I would like to thank the committee for fully funding the mitigation program for repetitively flooded properties authorized by our Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2004. That wasn't the case in previous years, but this year people have recognized the National Flood Insurance Program is in a severe crisis. It is \$20 billion in debt. This funding will help put it back on the right track.

The repetitively flooded properties, which make up just 1 percent of the insured properties, account for 25 percent of the repetitive flood loss. Mitigating these properties will not only keep people out of harm's way but it will save other flood insurance policyholders thousands of dollars in premiums over the years. If we can reduce just one 10 percent policy increase, that is a savings to the policyholders of \$160 million a year, every year, on into the future.

FEMA has already reported that their mitigation and building standards have resulted in saving \$1 billion annually in reduced flood loss. If we can continue moving forward, each dollar that we invest in helping keep people out of harm's way, each dollar we invest saves \$4 in damages later on, and that doesn't speak to the heart-wrenching loss that people face.

Now, there are going to come before us some amendments that really border on being goofy. There is an amendment being offered by Mrs. MILLER of Michigan to prevent FEMA from raising the base flood elevation in the mapping project. Think about it for a moment. This would be an amendment that would prevent FEMA from providing an accurate map for people in harm's way. Think about the thousands of people in Katrina that suffered loss to their property, loss of life because they didn't know they were in the floodplain. What in the name of all that is holy do we advance by preventing FEMA from doing its job? I sincerely hope that this misguided effort, should it come to the floor, will be rejected.

Finally, I hope that this is the last time, and that my friend, the chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, who is here, and I come to the floor dealing with the Department of Homeland Security, dealing with FEMA, because FEMA doesn't belong in that agency. One of the reasons we saw the bumbling, the incompetence, the loss of life, the bureaucratic foul-up during Katrina is because FEMA got lost in the bureaucracy of the Department of Homeland Security. We took an outstanding agency, stuffed it with cronies, shoved it into a massive bureaucracy and people's lives were lost as a result.

I hope this body has the wisdom to deal with the legislation the chairman is bringing forward, I think unanimously, from the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, to put FEMA back where it belongs, give it competent people, in order to save lives and save money.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman coming forth and speaking very clearly. I think unanimously, from the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, to put FEMA back where it belongs, give it competent people, in order to save lives and save money.

The gentleman from Chattanooga, Tennessee, ZACH WAMP, who sits on the committee, is an example of one of the members of this committee, the Appropriations Committee, who is spending time to look very carefully at this effort. Congressman WAMP, being from Chattanooga, Tennessee, is in the mid-

dle of the storms that come and go not only across our southern borders, the gulf region, but also as a member of this Homeland Security Oversight Subcommittee, and he is concerned about what the right thing to do is.

So I have confidence that people like HAL ROGERS and ZACH WAMP, who care about and can listen to the discussions from other Members, will eventually rectify this issue. HAL ROGERS spoke very clearly that it is his intent right now to provide them the necessary resources and to continue working with them to where they are prepared and ready for this summer, having learned lessons from the past.

So I think, and I hope that money that we have provided now and the input that has been provided from Members of Congress in this authorization will go a long way to learning from the past and being prepared for the future.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I will be calling for a "no" vote on the previous question so that I can amend the rule and allow the House to consider the Sabo chemical plant security provision that was left exposed to a point of order in the rule, and the Obey amendment to address the funding shortfalls in the bill.

Efforts to allow the full House to consider these two important initiatives were rejected in the Rules Committee yesterday by a straight party-line vote.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendments and extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. The Sabo language would require the Secretary of Homeland Security within 6 months to issue regulations for the security of chemical facilities in the United States. This language was added to the bill during the Appropriations Committee markup, but was exposed to a point of order in the Rules Committee.

Madam Speaker, whether or not Members support this provision to increase security at vulnerable chemical facilities, we should, at the very least, have an opportunity for an up-or-down vote on the provision and not have it stricken on a point of order.

The Obey amendment will increase funding by \$3.5 billion to help address a number of the bill's seriously underfunded programs and the services that are vital to homeland security. It will provide for increased Border Patrol agents, increased immigration investigators, and increased capacity and detention facilities. It fully funds the Port Security Grant program at the level enacted by the House just 2 weeks ago. It provides funds for Customs and Border Protection and the Coast Guard to better protect our ports. And it re-

stores cuts in programs that assist local first responders in disaster preparation. It also provides for substantial expansion of resources to support aviation explosive detection for air cargo and passengers and carry-on bags.

The Obey amendment does this and more without imposing any increase in our awful deficit. The entire cost of the amendment is offset by a slight reduction in the tax cut for those fortunate individuals in this Nation having annual incomes of over \$1 million.

Unfortunately, the homeland security appropriations bill before us today is inadequately funded in a number of areas that are vitally important to our Nation's security. We are all aware that Federal dollars are limited; but when it comes to the safety and security of the American people, we have to find a way to fund those programs in ways that will protect our citizens. Democrats believe in keeping our promises. The Obey amendment will help us support these efforts and do so without adding to the debt.

Madam Speaker, I want to point out a "no" will not prevent us from considering the homeland security appropriations bill under an open rule, but a "no" vote will allow Members to vote on the Sabo and Obey proposals. Vote "no" on the previous question.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman from New York engaging in what I thought was a fair and balanced discussion about the homeland security appropriations bill. I think it is important that we remember that the balance of what we do says a lot about the success of this government to focus and make sure that we are prepared to ensure that this great Nation is protected by those very important first responders and the United States Government, which has this obligation.

During this time, we have spent a lot of time talking about Members of Congress who focused on the policy issues, but there has also been a lot of work that has been done by many other people. I mentioned my work with Customs and Border Protection. I would like to thank Major General Kostelnick at CBP Air for personally engaging me; Mike Conaway from Midland, Texas, on his thoughts and ideas for the work of the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee.

We have also spent a lot of time at the White House. The White House has reached out to Members of Congress to find out their thoughts and ideas, and I think the President is well represented by his legislative staff who have come and listened to us and tried to take those thoughts and ideas back to formulate a balanced policy with the administration's position. I want to thank them:

Candi Wolfe; for his professionalism and grace and balance, Brian Conklin; for the star of the White House legislative team, Elan Liang; Chris Frech and

Peter Rowan, because they have been an equal part of the success of this important bill as it moves forward.

I am proud of what we have done. I ask for all the Members' support not only on this rule but the important legislation which makes sure that we have a balanced policy effort and funding effort to make sure this country is protected.

I thank God every day that America rises to its feet, has an economy that works the way it does and the strength and power to lead this world economy, and for strength and peace.

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

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES. 836—RULE FOR H.R. 5441 HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FY 2007

In the resolution, on page 2, line 12, after "Section 512;" add "and".

On page 2, line 13 strike the following: "and section 536".

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

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the amendment designated in section 3 of this resolution, which may be offered only by Rep. Obey or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment (except for pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate), and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendment are waived.

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

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 5441, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. OBEY OF WISCONSIN

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

TITLE VI—PREPARING FOR AND PREVENTING KNOWN THREATS AND IMPROVING BORDER SECURITY

CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses", \$880,000,000, to remain available until expended, for 1,800 additional border patrol agents, 300 additional customs agents and inspectors, improvements to the automated targeting system as recommended by the Government Accountability Office, and expansion of the Container Security Initiative.

AIR AND MARINE INTERDICTION, OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE, AND PROCUREMENT

For an additional amount for "Air and Marine Interdiction, Operations, Maintenance, and Procurement", \$170,000,000, to remain available until expended, for additional operating hours, the purchase of additional air assets, aircraft recapitalization, and establishment of the final northern border airwing.

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", \$300,000,000, to remain available until expended.

IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses", \$730,000,000, to remain available until expended, for not less than 9,000 additional detention beds and 800 additional immigration enforcement agents.

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION AVIATION SECURITY

For an additional amount for "Aviation Security", \$200,000,000, to remain available

until September 30, 2008, for checkpoint support technology and passenger, baggage, and cargo screening.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Operating Expenses", \$50,000,000.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

For an additional amount for "Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements", \$200,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008, for the automatic identification system.

PREPAREDNESS

OFFICE OF GRANTS AND TRAINING STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "State and Local Programs", \$340,000,000, of which \$100,000,000 shall be for intercity rail passenger transportation (as defined in section 24102 of title 49, United States Code), freight rail, and transit security grants; \$200,000,000 shall be for port security grants; and \$40,000,000 shall be for grants to States pursuant to section 204(a) of the REAL ID Act of 2005 (division B of Public Law 109-13).

FIREFIGHTER ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For an additional amount for "Firefighter Assistance Grants", \$150,000,000, of which \$75,000,000 shall be available to carry out section 33 of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2229) and \$75,000,000 shall be available to carry out section 34 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 2229a).

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE GRANTS

For an additional amount for "Emergency Management Performance Grants", \$150,000,000.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY READINESS, MITIGATION, RESPONSE, AND RECOVERY

For an additional amount for "Readiness, Mitigation, Response, and Recovery", \$50,000,000.

FLOOD MAP MODERNIZATION FUND

For an additional amount for "Flood Map Modernization Fund", \$150,000,000.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses", \$30,000,000, to remain available until expended.

DOMESTIC NUCLEAR DETECTION OFFICE

For an additional amount for "Domestic Nuclear Detection Office", \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended, for the purchase and deployment of radiation detection equipment.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 601. In the case of taxpayers with income in excess of \$1,000,000, for calendar year 2007 the amount of tax reduction resulting from the enactment of Public Laws 107-16, 108-27, and 108-311 shall be reduced by 8.47 percent.

SEC. 602. The amounts appropriated by this title shall be available for obligation, and the authorities provided in this title shall apply, upon the enactment of this Act.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: motion to recommit H.R. 5429, by the yeas and nays; passage of H.R. 5429, if ordered; ordering the previous question on H. Res. 836, by the yeas and nays; adoption of H. Res. 836, if ordered.

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

AMERICAN-MADE ENERGY AND GOOD JOBS ACT

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. GEORGE MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the vote on the motion to recommit on H.R. 5429 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 201, nays 223, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 208]

YEAS—201

Abercrombie	Cooper	Higgins
Ackerman	Costello	Hinchey
Allen	Crowley	Holden
Andrews	Cummings	Holt
Baca	Davis (AL)	Honda
Baird	Davis (CA)	Hooley
Baldwin	Davis (FL)	Hoyer
Barrow	Davis (IL)	Inglis (SC)
Bass	DeFazio	Insee
Bean	DeGette	Israel
Becerra	Delahunt	Jackson (IL)
Berkley	DeLauro	Jackson-Lee
Berman	Dicks	(TX)
Bishop (GA)	Dingell	Johnson (CT)
Bishop (NY)	Doggett	Johnson (IL)
Blumenauer	Doyle	Johnson, E. B.
Boehlert	Ehlers	Jones (NC)
Boswell	Emanuel	Jones (OH)
Boyd	Engel	Kanjorski
Bradley (NH)	Eshoo	Kaptur
Brady (PA)	Etheridge	Kennedy (MN)
Brown (OH)	Farr	Kildee
Brown, Corrine	Fattah	Kilpatrick (MI)
Butterfield	Finler	Kind
Capps	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Kirk
Capuano	Ford	Kucinich
Cardin	Frank (MA)	Langevin
Cardoza	Gerlach	Lantos
Carnahan	Gilchrest	Larsen (WA)
Carson	Gordon	Larson (CT)
Castle	Green, Al	Leach
Chandler	Grijalva	Lee
Clay	Gutierrez	Levin
Cleaver	Harman	Lewis (GA)
Clyburn	Hastings (FL)	Lipinski
Conyers	Herse	LoBiondo

Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey
 Lynch
 Maloney
 Markey
 Marshall
 Matsui
 McCarthy
 McCollum (MN)
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McIntyre
 McKinney
 McNulty
 Meehan
 Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Michaud
 Millender-
 McDonald
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, George
 Moore (KS)
 Moore (WI)
 Moran (VA)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal (MA)
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Olver
 Owens
 Pallone

Pascrell
 Pastor
 Paul
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Platts
 Pomeroy
 Price (NC)
 Rahall
 Ramstad
 Tauscher
 Rangel
 Rohrabacher
 Rothman
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sabo
 Salazar
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sanders
 Saxton
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schwartz (PA)
 Scott (GA)
 Scott (VA)
 Serrano
 Shays
 Sherman
 Simmons

NAYS—223

Aderholt
 Akin
 Alexander
 Bachus
 Baker
 Barrett (SC)
 Bartlett (MD)
 Barton (TX)
 Beauprez
 Berry
 Biggert
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Blackburn
 Blunt
 Boehner
 Bonilla
 Bonner
 Bono
 Boozman
 Boren
 Boucher
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Brown (SC)
 Brown-Waite,
 Ginny
 Burgess
 Burton (IN)
 Buyer
 Calvert
 Camp (MI)
 Campbell (CA)
 Cannon
 Cantor
 Capito
 Carter
 Case
 Chabot
 Chocola
 Coble
 Cole (OK)
 Conaway
 Costa
 Cramer
 Crenshaw
 Cubin
 Cuellar
 Davis (KY)
 Davis (TN)
 Davis, Jo Ann
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Doolittle
 Drake
 Dreier
 Duncan
 Edwards
 Emerson
 English (PA)
 Everett

Feeney
 Ferguson
 Foley
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Fossella
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gallegly
 Garrett (NJ)
 Gibbons
 Gillmor
 Gingrey
 Gohmert
 Gonzalez
 Bonilla
 Goodlatte
 Granger
 Graves
 Green (WI)
 Green, Gene
 Gutknecht
 Hall
 Harris
 Hart
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayes
 Hayworth
 Hefley
 Hensarling
 Herger
 Hinojosa
 Hobson
 Hoekstra
 Hostettler
 Hulshof
 Hunter
 Hyde
 Issa
 Istook
 Jefferson
 Jenkins
 Jindal
 Johnson, Sam
 Keller
 Kelly
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kline
 Knollenberg
 Kolbe
 Kuhl (NY)
 LaHood
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Mack

Manzullo
 Marchant
 Matheson
 McCaul (TX)
 McCotter
 McCreery
 McHenry
 McHugh
 McKeon
 McMorris
 Melancon
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary
 Moran (KS)
 Murphy
 Neugebauer
 Ney
 Northup
 Norwood
 Nunes
 Nussle
 Ortiz
 Osborne
 Otter
 Oxley
 Pearce
 Pence
 Peterson (MN)
 Peterson (PA)
 Petri
 Pickering
 Pitts
 Poe
 Pombo
 Porter
 Price (GA)
 Pryce (OH)
 Putnam
 Radanovich
 Regula
 Rehberg
 Ross
 Royce
 Ryan (WI)
 Ryun (KS)
 Schmidt
 Schwarz (MI)
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shaw

Sherwood
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Sodrel
 Souder
 Stearns
 Sullivan
 Sweeney

Tancredo
 Taylor (NC)
 Terry
 Thomas
 Thornberry
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Turner
 Upton
 Walden (OR)
 Walsh

Wamp
 Weldon (FL)
 Weldon (PA)
 Weller
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wicker
 Wilson (NM)
 Wolf
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Culberson
 DeLay
 Evans

Flake
 Kennedy (RI)
 Mollohan

Snyder
 Wilson (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1522

Messrs. McCaul of Texas, RADANOVICH and GONZALEZ changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. SMITH of Washington, BAIRD, PAUL, DOGGETT and JONES of North Carolina changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 201, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

YEAS—225

Aderholt
 Akin
 Alexander
 Bachus
 Baker
 Barrett (SC)
 Barton (TX)
 Beauprez
 Berry
 Biggert
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (UT)
 Blackburn
 Blunt
 Boehner
 Bonilla
 Bonner
 Bono
 Boozman
 Boren
 Boustany
 Boyd
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Brown (SC)
 Brown-Waite,
 Ginny
 Burgess
 Burton (IN)
 Buyer
 Calvert
 Camp (MI)
 Campbell (CA)
 Cannon
 Cantor
 Capito
 Cardoza
 Carter
 Chabot
 Chocola

Coble
 Cole (OK)
 Conaway
 Costa
 Cramer
 Crenshaw
 Cubin
 Cuellar
 Davis (AL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis (TN)
 Davis, Jo Ann
 Deal (GA)
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Doolittle
 Drake
 Dreier
 Duncan
 Edwards
 Emerson
 English (PA)
 Everett
 Feeney
 Foley
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Fossella
 Drake
 Dreier
 Hulshof
 Hunter
 Hyde
 Hobson
 Hoekstra
 Hostettler
 Hulshof
 Hunter
 Hyde
 Issa
 Istook
 Jefferson
 Jenkins
 Jindal
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones (NC)
 Kanjorski
 Keller
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kline
 Knollenberg
 Kolbe
 Kuhl (NY)
 LaHood
 Latham
 LaTourette

Graves
 Green (WI)
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Gutknecht
 Hall
 Harris
 Hart
 Hastert
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayes
 Hayworth
 Hefley
 Hensarling
 Herger
 Hinojosa
 Hinojosa
 Hobson
 Hoekstra
 Hostettler
 Hulshof
 Hunter
 Hyde
 Issa
 Istook
 Jefferson
 Jenkins
 Jindal
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones (NC)
 Kanjorski
 Keller
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kline
 Knollenberg
 Kolbe
 Kuhl (NY)
 LaHood
 Latham
 LaTourette

Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Mack
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 McCaul (TX)
 McCotter
 McCreery
 McHenry
 McHugh
 McKeon
 McMorris
 Melancon
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary
 Moran (KS)
 Murphy
 Murtha
 Musgrave
 Myrick
 Neugebauer
 Ney
 Northup
 Norwood
 Nunes
 Nussle
 Ortiz
 Osborne
 Otter

Oxley
 Paul
 Pearce
 Pence
 Peterson (MN)
 Peterson (PA)
 Pickering
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe
 Pombo
 Porter
 Price (GA)
 Pryce (OH)
 Putnam
 Radanovich
 Regula
 Rehberg
 Renzi
 Reyes
 Reynolds
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Ross
 Royce
 Ryan (WI)
 Ryun (KS)
 Schmidt
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shaw
 Sherwood

Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Skelton
 Smith (TX)
 Sodrel
 Souder
 Stearns
 Sullivan
 Sweeney
 Tancredo
 Tanner
 Taylor (MS)
 Taylor (NC)
 Terry
 Thomas
 Thompson (MS)
 Thornberry
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Turner
 Upton
 Walden (OR)
 Wamp
 Weldon (FL)
 Weldon (PA)
 Weller
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wicker
 Wilson (NM)
 Wolf
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)

NAYS—201

Abercrombie
 Ackerman
 Allen
 Andrews
 Baca
 Baird
 Baldwin
 Barrow
 Bartlett (MD)
 Bass
 Bean
 Becerra
 Berkley
 Berman
 Bishop (NY)
 Blumenuer
 Boehlert
 Boswell
 Boucher
 Bradley (NH)
 Brown (OH)
 Brown, Corrine
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardin
 Carnahan
 Carson
 Case
 Castle
 Chandler
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costello
 Crowley
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (FL)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis, Tom
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Ehlers
 Emanuel
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Etheridge
 Farr
 Fattah
 Ferguson
 Filner
 Fitzpatrick (PA)
 Ford

Frank (MA)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gerlach
 Gilchrest
 Gonzalez
 Gordon
 Grijalva
 Gutierrez
 Harman
 Hastings (FL)
 Herseth
 Higgins
 Hinchey
 Holden
 Holt
 Honda
 Hooley
 Hoyer
 Inglis (SC)
 Inslee
 Israel
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
 Johnson (CT)
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones (OH)
 Kaptur
 Kelly
 Kennedy (MN)
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick (MI)
 Kind
 Kirk
 Kucinich
 Langevin
 Lantos
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey
 Lynch
 Maloney
 Markey
 Marshall
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy
 McCollum (MN)
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McIntyre
 McKinney
 McNulty
 Meehan

Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Michaud
 Millender-
 McDonald
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, George
 Moore (KS)
 Moore (WI)
 Moran (VA)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal (MA)
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Olver
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Petri
 Pomeroy
 Price (NC)
 Rahall
 Ramstad
 Rangel
 Reichert
 Rothman
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sabo
 Salazar
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sanders
 Saxton
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schwartz (PA)
 Schwarz (MI)
 Scott (GA)
 Scott (VA)
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Shays
 Sherman
 Simmons
 Slaughter
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Solis
 Spratt
 Stark
 Strickland
 Stupak
 Tauscher
 Thompson (CA)

Tierney	Walsh	Weiner
Towns	Wasserman	Wexler
Udall (CO)	Schultz	Woolsey
Udall (NM)	Waters	Wu
Van Hollen	Watson	Wynn
Velázquez	Watt	
Visclosky	Waxman	

NOT VOTING—7

DeLay	Kennedy (RI)	Wilson (SC)
Evans	Mollohan	
Flake	Snyder	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1531

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO REDUCE TIME FOR ELECTRONIC VOTING DURING CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5441, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, during consideration of H.R. 5441 pursuant to House Resolution 836, the Chair may reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting under clause 6 of rule XVIII and clause 9 of rule XX.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5441, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 836 on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 195, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 210]

YEAS—217

Aderholt	Bass	Boehner
Akin	Beauprez	Bonilla
Alexander	Biggart	Bonner
Bachus	Bilirakis	Bono
Baker	Bishop (UT)	Boozman
Barrett (SC)	Blackburn	Boustany
Bartlett (MD)	Blunt	Bradley (NH)
Barton (TX)	Boehler	Brady (TX)

Brown (SC)	Hayworth	Peterson (MN)	Langevin	Nadler	Serrano
Brown-Waite,	Hefley	Peterson (PA)	Lantos	Napolitano	Sherman
Ginny	Hensarling	Petri	Larsen (WA)	Neal (MA)	Skelton
Burgess	Herger	Pickering	Larson (CT)	Oberstar	Slaughter
Burton (IN)	Hobson	Pitts	Lee	Obey	Smith (WA)
Calvert	Hoekstra	Platts	Levin	Olver	Solis
Camp (MI)	Hostettler	Poe	Lewis (GA)	Ortiz	Spratt
Campbell (CA)	Hulshof	Pombo	Lipinski	Owens	Stark
Cannon	Hunter	Porter	Lofgren, Zoe	Pallone	Strickland
Cantor	Hyde	Price (GA)	Lowey	Pascarell	Stupak
Capito	Inglis (SC)	Pryce (OH)	Lynch	Pastor	Tanner
Carter	Issa	Putnam	Maloney	Payne	Tauscher
Castle	Istook	Ramstad	Markey	Pelosi	Taylor (MS)
Chabot	Jenkins	Regula	Marshall	Pomeroy	Thompson (CA)
Chocola	Jindal	Rehberg	Matheson	Price (NC)	Thompson (MS)
Coble	Johnson (CT)	Reichert	Matsui	Rahall	Tierney
Cole (OK)	Johnson (IL)	Renzi	McCarthy	Rangel	Towns
Conaway	Johnson, Sam	Reynolds	McCollum (MN)	Reyes	Udall (CO)
Crenshaw	Jones (NC)	Rogers (AL)	McDermott	Ross	Udall (NM)
Cubin	Keller	Rogers (MI)	McGovern	Rothman	Van Hollen
Culberson	Kelly	Rohrabacher	McIntyre	Roybal-Allard	Velázquez
Davis (KY)	Kennedy (MN)	Ros-Lehtinen	McKinney	Ruppersberger	Visclosky
Davis, Jo Ann	King (IA)	Royce	McNulty	Rush	Wasserman
Davis, Tom	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)	Meehan	Ryan (OH)	Schultz
Deal (GA)	Kingston	Ryun (KS)	Meek (FL)	Sabo	Waters
Dent	Kline	Schmidt	Melancon	Salazar	Watson
Diaz-Balart, L.	Knollenberg	Schwarz (MI)	Michaud	Sánchez, Linda	Watt
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kolbe	Sensenbrenner	Millender-	T.	Waxman
Doolittle	Kuhl (NY)	Sessions	McDonald	Sanchez, Loretta	Weiner
Drake	LaHood	Shadegg	Miller (NC)	Sanders	Wexler
Dreier	Latham	Shaw	Miller, George	Schakowsky	Woolsey
Duncan	LaTourette	Shays	Moore (KS)	Schiff	Wu
Ehlers	Leach	Sherwood	Moore (WI)	Schwartz (PA)	Wynn
Emerson	Lewis (CA)	Shimkus	Moran (VA)	Scott (GA)	
English (PA)	Lewis (KY)	Shuster	Murtha	Scott (VA)	
Everett	Linder	Simmons			
Feeney	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)			
Ferguson	Lucas	Smith (TX)			
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Lungren, Daniel	Sodrel			
Foley	E.	Souder			
Forbes	Mack	Stearns			
Fortenberry	Manzullo	Sullivan			
Fossella	Marchant	Sweeney			
Fox	McCaul (TX)	Tancredo			
Franks (AZ)	McCotter	Taylor (NC)			
Frelinghuysen	McCrery	Terry			
Gallegly	McHenry	Thomas			
Garrett (NJ)	McHugh	Thornberry			
Gerlach	McMorris	Tiahrt			
Gibbons	Miller (MI)	Tiberi			
Gilchrest	Miller, Gary	Turner			
Gillmor	Moran (KS)	Upton			
Gingrey	Murphy	Walden (OR)			
Gohmert	Musgrave	Walsh			
Goode	Myrick	Wamp			
Goodlatte	Neugebauer	Weldon (FL)			
Granger	Ney	Weldon (PA)			
Graves	Northup	Weller			
Green (WI)	Norwood	Westmoreland			
Gutknecht	Nunes	Whitfield			
Hall	Nussle	Wicker			
Harris	Osborne	Wilson (NM)			
Hart	Otter	Wolf			
Hastings (WA)	Paul	Young (AK)			
Hayes	Pearce	Young (FL)			

NAYS—195

Abercrombie	Clay	Ford
Ackerman	Cleaver	Frank (MA)
Allen	Clyburn	Gonzalez
Andrews	Conyers	Gordon
Baca	Cooper	Green, Al
Baird	Costa	Green, Gene
Baldwin	Costello	Grijalva
Barrow	Cramer	Gutierrez
Bean	Crowley	Harman
Becerra	Cuellar	Hastings (FL)
Berkley	Cummings	Herseth
Berman	Davis (AL)	Higgins
Berry	Davis (CA)	Hinchev
Bishop (GA)	Davis (FL)	Hinojosa
Bishop (NY)	Davis (IL)	Holden
Blumenauer	Davis (TN)	Holt
Boren	DeFazio	Honda
Boswell	DeGette	Hooey
Boucher	Delahunt	Hoyer
Boyd	DeLauro	Inslie
Brady (PA)	Dicks	Israel
Brown (OH)	Dingell	Jackson (IL)
Brown, Corrine	Doggett	Jackson-Lee
Butterfield	Doyle	(TX)
Capps	Edwards	Jefferson
Capuano	Emanuel	Johnson, E. B.
Cardin	Engel	Kanjorski
Cardoza	Eshoo	Kaptur
Carman	Etheridge	Kildee
Carson	Farr	Kilpatrick (MI)
Case	Fattah	Kind
Chandler	Filner	Kucinich

Buyer	McKeon	Radanovich
DeLay	Meeks (NY)	Rogers (KY)
Evans	Mica	Saxton
Flake	Miller (FL)	Simpson
Jones (OH)	Mollohan	Snyder
Kennedy (RI)	Oxley	Wilson (SC)
Kirk	Pence	

NOT VOTING—20

Buyer	McKeon	Radanovich
DeLay	Meeks (NY)	Rogers (KY)
Evans	Mica	Saxton
Flake	Miller (FL)	Simpson
Jones (OH)	Mollohan	Snyder
Kennedy (RI)	Oxley	Wilson (SC)
Kirk	Pence	

□ 1540

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 194(a) and the order of the House of December 18, 2005, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy:

Mr. TAYLOR, Mississippi.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4963

Mr. HYDE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 4963.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam 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. 5441, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 836 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. 5441.

□ 1545

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. 5441) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, with Mr. GILLMOR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be here to present the fiscal year 2007 Homeland Security Appropriations Bill. The bill provides just over \$32 billion in discretionary funds for the upcoming fiscal year, that is \$1.8 billion above the current year, providing ample resources to fund the Department's operations in 2007.

After 3 years, the Department of Homeland Security has made enormous progress, but much work remains. The past year has been challenging. We have seen military-like incursions at the border, learned of potential vulnerabilities within port security and witnessed a massive failure in our Nation's preparedness and response during Hurricane Katrina. It has not been an easy year.

I have watched the Department tackle these challenges, and have been forthcoming in both my criticisms and praise, and they deserve both. Now, in its fourth year of existence, DHS is still struggling to merge its 22 legacy agencies.

Basic business systems are not yet established. And there is a constant shuffling of responsibilities and positions. From one day to the next, it is hard to determine who is in charge of what effort. On top of the mundane job of simply managing a large bureaucracy of over 180,000 employees, the De-

partment is often focused on managing the crisis of the day. Part of this is necessary. Katrina's aftermath certainly required the attention of DHS leadership.

But I do not think the Department should lose sight of its long range goals and diverse legacy missions, to deal exclusively with the latest crisis. Nor, do I think that we as a Congress can afford to be so caught up in today's crisis that we fail to provide balance, stability and aggressive oversight within the Department's operations.

The President's budget put a strong emphasis on two areas, borders and immigration security, and nuclear detection. These are certainly homeland security priorities which I support. But increases in these areas came at the expense of everything else, resulting in reduced funding for first responders, port security and legacy agencies such as the Secret Service.

The bill before you shifts some of these resources and provides a balance among all of the Homeland Security priorities. It gives the Department the tools, assets and direction it needs to prepare our Nation for both terrorist attacks and natural disasters.

Since September 11, we have provided \$217.6 billion for homeland security, including \$116.9 billion for the Department itself. This does not include emergency appropriations for Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Wilma.

For the past 3 years, we have provided funds to get the Department up and running. But this year marks a turning point for the Department. It is 3 years old. It is already up and running. We now expect results. No longer will we tolerate excuses and delays due to reorganizations, personnel shortages and poor financial management. Those days are over. We need to have confidence that this money is making a difference and that as a Nation we are safer and better prepared.

The bill includes a number of initiatives designed to compel the Department to develop strategies and milestones for performance. To eliminate any ambiguity of Congressional intent, the bill fences funds until certain actions are performed. In fact, a total of \$1.3 billion is withheld until we have strategic plans, expenditure plans, and better financial data throughout the Department.

The bill also balances funding across all programs, not just a select few. But there are some caveats. We give money to the Department, but we also require results. For port security, cargo security and container security, we include \$4.185 billion, a significant sum of money, but not without strings.

There are stringent performance requirements, such as doubling the amount of cargo inspected, 100 percent screening of all cargo and the establishment of minimum security standards for all cargo containers.

It also requires that DHS double the amount of cargo screened for radiation. These requirements are in line with the

recently considered SAFE Port Act, which overwhelming passed this House on May 4.

For border security and immigration enforcement, the bill is also generous. We provide \$19.6 billion, including almost \$4 billion for the Secure Border Initiative. Again, these funds do not come without strings. Strategic and expenditure plans must be submitted for this effort. Unless the Department can show us exactly what we are buying, we will not fund it. Since 1995, spending on border security has quadrupled from \$5.1 billion to over \$17.9 billion.

And the number of Border Patrol agents has more than doubled from 5,000 to 12,319. However, during this same period, the number of illegal immigrants has jumped from 5 million to an estimated 12 million people. The policy of more money and no results is no longer in effect.

We will not fund programs with false expectations. The American taxpayer deserves more. We learned many lessons, Mr. Chairman, from Hurricane Katrina. The Department has taken a number of steps to prepare for the start of the 2006 Hurricane season on June 1, including improvements to communications, logistics management, victim registration and debris removal.

However, much work remains. And we provide \$493 million to build FEMA's operational capabilities, including 200 new staff to improve incident and logistics management, evacuations and debris removal.

The bill includes \$3.2 billion for our first responders. This is in addition to the \$5.1 billion that is still in the pipeline waiting to be spent, moneys from previous years. Here, too, we require results. And we put pressure on DHS to measure progress in preparing our first responders.

Since September 11, we have given the first responders, we have provided \$37.4 billion. The question is, are they better trained? Are they better prepared? Are they better equipped? We do not know the answer to that, but we should. The bill includes a provision requiring DHS to develop a preparedness strategy and to measure the performance of first responders.

The bill provides \$6.4 billion for the Transportation Security Administration and the air marshals, including \$497 million for explosive detection systems, and \$55 million for air cargo security. It also continues to cap the number of screeners at 45,000, ensuring that TSA will not rely exclusively on people to secure aviation but rather use smart technologies to screen for explosives and other contraband.

We must get out of the cycle of simply giving more money for people when technology in many cases provides a better answer. The bill includes \$500 million for the domestic nuclear detection office. Much work has been done in this area over the past year, and the office has made significant progress in the areas of detection technologies and

coordinating Federal efforts. This work deserves our continued support.

Finally, I would like to point out that the bill includes \$1.3 billion for the Secret Service. I continue to believe the administration sometimes ignores the resource requirements of that agency. Despite dramatic increases in their workload for both protection and investigations, dollars have not been forthcoming.

This is a good example of where I think the administration is not paying enough attention to legacy missions, because they are so focused on bigger, more visible challenges.

This legislation, Mr. Chairman, supports our most critical Homeland Security priorities, keeps the Department on track to produce results and continues the committee's tradition of strict accountability. The recommendations in this bill reflect a balance among programs and operations, and I urge my colleagues to support the measure.

Mr. Chairman, this is the last year that my distinguished colleague, Mr. SABO, will be serving in the U.S. House. He has chosen to retire to his home in Minnesota. I want to pay him the highest compliment that I can. He has been

an able soldier. He has been a good work mate on this subcommittee. A good part of this bill is his handiwork. He is easy to work with. He reminds me a lot of that old adage that still water runs deep. He does not yell and scream. And yet he is extremely competent.

So I wish him well in his next life. I want him to know that we have enjoyed working with him. He has done a great service for his country. And we want to thank him for his distinguished service.

So, Mr. SABO, thank you for being a great partner.

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2007 (H.R. 5441)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS					
Departmental Operations					
Office of the Secretary and Executive Management:					
Immediate Office of the Secretary.....	2,369	3,148	2,648	+279	-500
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary.....	1,121	1,648	1,248	+127	-400
Chief of Staff.....	2,221	2,901	5,642	+3,421	+2,741
Office of Counternarcotics Enforcement.....	1,841	2,878	---	-1,841	-2,878
Executive Secretary.....	4,090	5,001	5,001	+911	---
Office of Policy.....	20,506	31,093	27,093	+6,587	-4,000
Secure Border Initiative Program Executive Office.....	---	---	5,000	+5,000	+5,000
Office of Public Affairs.....	8,229	6,808	6,000	-2,229	-808
Office of Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs.....	6,262	6,479	5,700	-562	-779
Office of General Counsel.....	11,154	14,065	14,065	+2,911	---
Office of Civil Rights and Liberties.....	12,870	13,125	13,125	+255	---
Citizenship and Immigration Services Ombudsman ...	3,615	5,927	5,927	+2,312	---
Privacy Officer.....	4,337	4,435	4,435	+98	---
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 109-148) Avian Flu (emergency).....	47,283	---	---	-47,283	---
Subtotal, Office of the Secretary and Executive Management.....	125,898	97,508	95,884	-30,014	-1,624
Appropriations.....	(78,615)	(97,508)	(95,884)	(+17,269)	(-1,624)
Emergency appropriations.....	(47,283)	---	---	(-47,283)	---
Office of Screening Coordination and Operations... ..	3,960	3,960	---	-3,960	-3,960
Office of the Under Secretary for Management:					
Under Secretary for Management.....	1,670	2,012	2,012	+342	---
Office of Security.....	50,765	58,514	51,914	+1,149	-6,600
Business Transformation Office.....	1,861	2,017	1,317	-544	-700
Office of the Chief Procurement Officer.....	8,930	16,895	16,895	+7,965	---
Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer:					
Salaries and expenses.....	8,811	9,827	9,227	+416	-600
MAX - HR System.....	29,700	71,449	29,700	---	-41,749
Subtotal, Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer.....	38,511	81,276	38,927	+416	-42,349
Office of the Chief Administrative Officer:					
Salaries and expenses.....	39,600	40,218	40,218	+618	---
Nebraska Avenue Complex (NAC-DHS Headquarters)	25,809	8,206	8,206	-17,603	---
Subtotal, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.....	65,409	48,424	48,424	-16,985	---
Subtotal, Office of the Under Secretary for Management.....	167,146	209,138	159,489	-7,657	-49,649
Office of the Chief Financial Officer.....	19,211	44,380	43,480	+24,269	-900
Office of the Chief Information Officer:					
Salaries and expenses.....	74,999	79,521	79,521	+4,522	---
Information technology services.....	82,609	61,013	61,013	-21,596	---
Security activities.....	18,810	64,139	105,139	+86,329	+41,000
Wireless program.....	85,140	86,438	86,438	+1,298	---
Homeland Secure Data Network (HSDN).....	32,699	32,654	32,654	-45	---
Subtotal, Office of the Chief Information Officer.....	294,257	323,765	364,765	+70,508	+41,000
Analysis and Operations.....	252,940	298,663	298,663	+45,723	---
Total, Departmental Operations.....	863,412	977,414	962,281	+98,869	-15,133
Appropriations.....	(816,129)	(977,414)	(962,281)	(+146,152)	(-15,133)
Emergency appropriations.....	(47,283)	---	---	(-47,283)	---

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2007 (H.R. 5441)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request

Office of the Federal Coordinator for Gulf Coast Rebuilding.....	---	---	3,000	+3,000	+3,000
Office of Inspector General					
Operating expenses.....	82,187	96,185	96,185	+13,998	---
=====					
Total, title I, Departmental Management and Operations.....	945,599	1,073,599	1,061,466	+115,867	-12,133
Appropriations.....	(898,316)	(1,073,599)	(1,061,466)	(+163,150)	(-12,133)
Emergency appropriations.....	(47,283)	---	---	(-47,283)	---
=====					
TITLE II - SECURITY, ENFORCEMENT, AND INVESTIGATIONS					
U.S. Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology	336,600	399,494	362,494	+25,894	-37,000
Customs and Border Protection					
Salaries and expenses:					
Headquarters, Management, and Administration:					
Management and administration, border security inspections and trade facilitation.....	648,450	663,943	658,943	+10,493	-5,000
Management and administration, border security and control between port of entry.....	584,100	594,446	589,446	+5,346	-5,000

Subtotal, Headquarters, Mgt, & Admin.....	1,232,550	1,258,389	1,248,389	+15,839	-10,000
Border security inspections and trade facilitation:					
Inspections, trade, and travel facilitation at ports of entry.....	1,249,648	1,282,102	1,282,102	+32,454	---
Harbor maintenance fee collection (trust fund)	3,000	3,026	3,026	+26	---
Container security initiative.....	137,402	139,312	139,312	+1,910	---
Other international programs.....	8,543	8,701	8,701	+158	---
Customs trade partnership against terrorism/ Free and Secure Trade (FAST) NEXUS/SENTRI...	74,515	75,909	91,009	+16,494	+15,100
Inspection and detection technology investments.....	62,394	94,317	94,317	+31,923	---
Automated targeting systems.....	27,970	27,298	27,298	-672	---
National Targeting Center.....	16,530	23,635	23,635	+7,105	---
Other technology investments, including information technology.....	1,008	1,027	1,027	+19	---
Training.....	24,107	24,564	24,564	+457	---

Subtotal, Border security inspections and trade facilitation.....	1,605,117	1,679,891	1,694,991	+89,874	+15,100
Border security and control between ports of entry:					
Border security and control.....	1,725,547	2,243,619	2,176,679	+451,132	-66,940
Border technology.....	30,971	131,559	---	-30,971	-131,559
Secure Border Initiative Technology and Tactical Infrastructure (SBIInet).....	---	---	115,000	+115,000	+115,000
Training.....	21,981	45,688	37,275	+15,294	-8,413

Subtotal, Border security and control between ports of entry.....	1,778,499	2,420,866	2,328,954	+550,455	-91,912
CBP Air and Marine Personnel Compensation and Benefits.....	161,924	159,876	162,976	+1,052	+3,100
Supplemental appropriations:					
Salaries and expenses (P.L.109-148, emergency)	24,100	---	---	-24,100	---

Subtotal, Salaries and expenses.....	4,802,190	5,519,022	5,435,310	+633,120	-83,712
Appropriations.....	(4,775,090)	(5,515,996)	(5,432,284)	(+657,194)	(-83,712)
Emergency appropriations.....	(24,100)	---	---	(-24,100)	---
Trust fund.....	(3,000)	(3,026)	(3,026)	(+26)	---

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2007 (H.R. 5441)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Automation modernization:					
Automated commercial environment/International Trade Data System (ITDS).....	316,800	318,490	316,800	---	-1,690
Automated commercial system and legacy IT costs....	134,640	142,717	134,640	---	-8,077
Subtotal, Automation modernization.....	451,440	461,207	451,440	---	-9,767
CBP Air and Marine Interdiction, Operations, Maintenance, and Procurement:					
Operations and maintenance.....	260,323	265,966	301,466	+41,143	+35,500
Unmanned aerial vehicles.....	10,078	10,353	10,353	+275	---
Procurement.....	125,827	61,380	61,380	-64,447	---
Subtotal, Air and marine interdiction, operations, maintenance, and procurement.....	396,228	337,699	373,199	-23,029	+35,500
Construction:					
Construction (Border patrol).....	267,300	255,954	175,154	-92,146	-80,800
(P.L. 109-148, emergency).....	10,400	---	---	-10,400	---
Subtotal, Construction.....	277,700	255,954	175,154	-102,546	-80,800
Total, Direct appropriations.....	5,927,558	6,573,882	6,435,103	+507,545	-138,779
Fee accounts:					
Immigration inspection user fee.....	(464,816)	(529,300)	(529,300)	(+64,484)	---
Immigration enforcement fines.....	(6,403)	(1,724)	(1,724)	(-4,679)	---
Land border inspection fee.....	(29,878)	(28,071)	(28,071)	(-1,807)	---
COBRA passenger inspection fee.....	(334,000)	(387,804)	(387,804)	(+53,804)	---
APHIS inspection fee.....	(204,000)	(214,287)	(214,287)	(+10,287)	---
Puerto Rico collections.....	(97,815)	(97,815)	(97,815)	---	---
Small airport user fees.....	(5,234)	(6,230)	(6,230)	(+996)	---
Subtotal, fee accounts.....	(1,142,146)	(1,265,231)	(1,265,231)	(+123,085)	---
Total, Customs and Border Protection.....	(7,069,704)	(7,839,113)	(7,700,334)	(+630,630)	(-138,779)
Appropriations.....	(5,893,058)	(6,573,882)	(6,435,103)	(+542,045)	(-138,779)
Emergency appropriations.....	(34,500)	---	---	(-34,500)	---
(Fee accounts).....	(1,142,146)	(1,265,231)	(1,265,231)	(+123,085)	---
Immigration and Customs Enforcement					
Salaries and expenses:					
Headquarters Management and Administration (non-Detention and Removal Operations):					
Personnel compensation and benefits, service and other costs.....	122,364	---	131,287	+8,923	+131,287
Headquarters managed IT investment.....	131,773	---	134,015	+2,242	+134,015
Subtotal, Headquarters management and administration.....	254,137	---	265,302	+11,165	+265,302
Legal proceedings.....	128,879	206,511	187,353	+58,474	-19,158
Investigations:					
Domestic.....	1,183,100	1,456,650	1,317,992	+134,892	-138,658
International.....	100,899	104,744	105,181	+4,282	+437
Subtotal, Investigations.....	1,283,999	1,561,394	1,423,173	+139,174	-138,221
Intelligence:					
Intelligence.....	50,460	57,932	51,379	+919	-6,553
Subtotal, Intelligence.....	50,460	57,932	51,379	+919	-6,553
Detention and removal operations:					
Custody Operations.....	1,003,196	1,432,702	1,291,220	+288,024	-141,482
Fugitive operations.....	101,852	173,784	199,853	+98,001	+26,069
Criminal Alien program.....	93,029	110,250	105,357	+12,328	-4,893
Alternatives to detention.....	28,212	42,702	46,145	+17,933	+3,443

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2007 (H.R. 5441)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Transportation and removal program.....	133,650	317,016	273,475	+139,825	-43,541
Subtotal, Detention and removal operations..	1,359,939	2,076,454	1,916,050	+556,111	-160,404
Salaries and expenses (P.L.109-148, emergency)....	13,000	---	---	-13,000	---
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses.....	3,090,414	3,902,291	3,843,257	+752,843	-59,034
Appropriations.....	(3,077,414)	(3,902,291)	(3,843,257)	(+765,843)	(-59,034)
Emergency appropriations.....	(13,000)	---	---	(-13,000)	---
Federal protective service:					
Basic security.....	109,235	123,310	123,310	+14,075	---
Building specific security (including capital equipment replacement/acquisition).....	377,765	392,701	392,701	+14,936	---
Subtotal.....	487,000	516,011	516,011	+29,011	---
Offsetting fee collections.....	-487,000	-516,011	-516,011	-29,011	---
Automation modernization:					
ATLAS.....	39,749	---	---	-39,749	---
Construction.....	26,281	26,281	26,281	---	---
Total, Direct appropriations.....	3,156,444	3,928,572	3,869,538	+713,094	-59,034
Fee accounts:					
Immigration inspection user fee.....	(100,000)	(108,000)	(108,000)	(+8,000)	---
Breached bond/detention fund.....	(87,000)	(90,000)	(90,000)	(+3,000)	---
Student exchange and visitor fee.....	(66,552)	(54,349)	(54,349)	(-12,203)	---
Subtotal, fee accounts.....	(253,552)	(252,349)	(252,349)	(-1,203)	---
Subtotal, Immigration and Customs Enforcement (gross).....	(3,896,996)	(4,696,932)	(4,637,898)	(+740,902)	(-59,034)
Offsetting fee collections.....	(-487,000)	(-516,011)	(-516,011)	(-29,011)	---
Total, Immigration and Customs Enforcement.....	(3,409,996)	(4,180,921)	(4,121,887)	(+711,891)	(-59,034)
Appropriations.....	(3,143,444)	(3,928,572)	(3,869,538)	(+726,094)	(-59,034)
Emergency appropriations.....	(13,000)	---	---	(-13,000)	---
(Fee accounts).....	(253,552)	(252,349)	(252,349)	(-1,203)	---
Transportation Security Administration					
Aviation security:					
Screener operations:					
Screener workforce:					
Privatized screening.....	138,257	148,600	148,600	+10,343	---
Passenger screener - personnel, compensation, and benefits.....	1,504,800	1,556,226	---	-1,504,800	-1,556,226
Baggage screener - personnel, compensation, and benefits.....	875,160	913,974	---	-875,160	-913,974
Passenger & Baggage screener - personnel, compensation, and benefits.....	---	---	2,470,200	+2,470,200	+2,470,200
Subtotal, Sceener workforce.....	2,518,217	2,618,800	2,618,800	+100,583	---
Screening training and other:					
Passenger screeners, other.....	23,514	23,352	---	-23,514	-23,352
Baggage screeners, other.....	133,446	133,114	---	-133,446	-133,114
Screener training.....	87,124	88,000	---	-87,124	-88,000
Subtotal, Screening training and other	244,084	244,466	---	-244,084	-244,466
Screening Training and Other.....	---	---	244,466	+244,466	+244,466
Human resource services.....	205,162	207,234	207,234	+2,072	---
Checkpoint support.....	163,350	173,366	173,366	+10,016	---

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2007 (H.R. 5441)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
EDS/ETD Systems:					
EDS Purchase.....	173,250	91,000	136,000	-37,250	+45,000
EDS Installation.....	44,550	94,000	94,000	+49,450	---
EDS/ETD Maintenance.....	198,000	234,000	234,000	+36,000	---
EDS/ETD Refurbishment.....	---	---	10,000	+10,000	+10,000
Operation integration.....	22,770	23,000	23,000	+230	---
Subtotal, EDS/ETD Systems.....	438,570	442,000	497,000	+58,430	+55,000
Subtotal, Screening operations.....	3,569,383	3,685,866	3,740,866	+171,483	+55,000
Aviation security direction and enforcement:					
Aviation regulation and other enforcement.....	220,192	217,516	217,516	-2,676	---
Airport management, IT, and support.....	679,172	666,032	666,032	-13,140	---
FFDO and flight crew training.....	30,195	30,470	25,000	-5,195	-5,470
Air cargo.....	54,450	55,000	55,000	+550	---
Airport perimeter security.....	4,950	---	---	-4,950	---
Foreign repair stations.....	2,970	---	---	-2,970	---
Subtotal, Aviation direction and enforcement	991,929	969,018	963,548	-28,381	-5,470
Aviation security capital fund.....	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	---	---
Subtotal, Aviation security (gross).....	4,561,312	4,654,884	4,704,414	+143,102	+49,530
Offsetting fee collections (non-mandatory)..	-1,990,000	-3,850,000	-2,420,000	-430,000	+1,230,000
Aviation security capital fund.....	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	---	---
Total, Aviation security (net).....	2,571,312	1,004,884	2,284,414	-286,898	+1,279,530
Surface transportation security:					
Staffing and operations.....	23,760	24,000	24,000	+240	---
Hazardous materials truck tracking/training.....	3,960	---	---	-3,960	---
Rail security inspectors and canines.....	7,920	13,200	13,200	+5,280	---
Subtotal, Surface transportation security.....	35,640	37,200	37,200	+1,560	---
Transportation Threat Assessment and Credentialing:					
SecureFlight.....	56,129	40,000	40,000	-16,129	---
Crew vetting.....	13,167	14,700	14,700	+1,533	---
Screening administration and operations.....	4,950	---	---	-4,950	---
Transpo Worker Id Credential (TWIC) - Direct Apro	---	---	20,000	+20,000	+20,000
Registered Traveler Program fees.....	(20,000)	(35,101)	(35,101)	(+15,101)	---
TWIC fees.....	(100,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(-80,000)	---
Hazardous materials fees.....	(50,000)	(19,000)	(19,000)	(-31,000)	---
Alien Flight School (by transfer from DOJ) - fees.	(10,000)	(2,000)	(2,000)	(-8,000)	---
Subtotal, Transportation Threat Assessment and Credentialing (Gross).....	(254,246)	(130,801)	(150,801)	(-103,445)	(+20,000)
Fee Funded Programs.....	(180,000)	(76,101)	(76,101)	(-103,899)	---
Subtotal, Transportation Threat Assessment and Credentialing (net)	74,246	54,700	74,700	+454	+20,000
Transportation security support:					
Administration:					
Headquarters administration.....	276,597	296,191	292,191	+15,594	-4,000
Information technology.....	207,991	210,092	210,092	+2,101	---
Subtotal, Administration.....	484,588	506,283	502,283	+17,695	-4,000
Intelligence.....	20,790	21,000	21,000	+210	---
Subtotal, Transportation security support.....	505,378	527,283	523,283	+17,905	-4,000
Federal Air Marshals:					
Management and Administration.....	607,266	628,494	628,494	+21,228	---
Travel and Training.....	70,092	70,800	70,800	+708	---
Air-to-ground communications.....	1,980	---	---	-1,980	---

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2007 (H.R. 5441)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Subtotal, Federal Air Marshals.....	679,338	699,294	699,294	+19,956	---
<hr/>					
Total, Transportation Security Administration (gross).....	6,285,914	6,299,462	6,364,992	+79,078	+65,530
Offsetting fee collections.....	-1,990,000	-3,650,000	-2,420,000	-430,000	+1,230,000
Aviation security capital fund.....	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	---	---
Fee accounts.....	(180,000)	(76,101)	(76,101)	(-103,899)	---
<hr/>					
Total, Transportation Security Administration (net).....	3,865,914	2,323,361	3,618,891	-247,023	+1,295,530
<hr/>					
United States Coast Guard					
Operating expenses:					
Military pay and allowances.....	2,974,770	2,788,276	2,788,276	-186,494	---
Civilian pay and benefits.....	526,182	569,434	569,434	+43,252	---
Training and recruiting.....	175,359	180,876	180,876	+5,517	---
Operating funds and unit level maintenance.....	947,400	1,061,574	1,009,374	+61,974	-52,200
Centrally managed accounts.....	183,150	207,954	207,954	+24,804	---
Intermediate and depot level maintenance.....	630,547	710,729	710,729	+80,182	---
Port Security.....	---	---	15,000	+15,000	+15,000
Emergency appropriation (P.L. 109-148).....	132,000	---	---	-132,000	---
Transfer from DOD, Operation Iraqi Freedom (P.L. 109-148).....	(100,000)	---	---	(-100,000)	---
Rescission (Port Security Assessments, PL 108-11).....	-15,104	---	---	+15,104	---
Rescission (P.L. 109-148).....	-260,533	---	---	+260,533	---
Less adjustment for defense function.....	-1,188,000	-340,000	-340,000	+848,000	---
Defense function portion.....	1,188,000	340,000	340,000	-848,000	---
<hr/>					
Subtotal, Operating expenses.....	5,293,771	5,518,843	5,481,643	+187,872	-37,200
Appropriations.....	(4,249,408)	(5,178,843)	(5,141,643)	(+892,235)	(-37,200)
Rescissions.....	(-275,637)	---	---	(+275,637)	---
Defense function portion.....	(1,188,000)	(340,000)	(340,000)	(-848,000)	---
Emergency appropriations.....	(132,000)	---	---	(-132,000)	---
(By transfer).....	(100,000)	---	---	(-100,000)	---
Environmental compliance and restoration.....	11,880	11,880	11,880	---	---
Reserve training.....	117,810	123,948	122,348	+4,538	-1,600
Acquisition, construction, and improvements:					
Vessels:					
Response boat medium (41ft UTB and NSB replacement).....	18,315	24,750	24,750	+6,435	---
Aircraft:					
Armed helicopter equipment (Phase I) (legacy asset).....	9,900	---	---	-9,900	---
Covert surveillance aircraft.....	9,900	---	---	-9,900	---
HH-60 replacement.....	---	---	15,000	+15,000	+15,000
<hr/>					
Subtotal, Aircraft.....	19,800	---	15,000	-4,800	+15,000
Other equipment:					
Automatic identification system.....	23,760	11,238	11,238	-12,522	---
National distress and response system modernization (Rescue 21).....	40,590	39,600	39,600	-990	---
HF Recap.....	---	2,475	2,475	+2,475	---
National Capital Region Air Defense.....	---	48,510	48,510	+48,510	---
Counter Terrorism Training Infrastructure - shoohouse.....	---	1,683	---	---	-1,683
<hr/>					
Subtotal, Other equipment.....	64,350	103,506	101,823	+37,473	-1,683
Personnel compensation and benefits:					
Core acquisition costs.....	495	500	500	+5	---
Direct personnel cost.....	72,270	80,500	80,500	+8,230	---

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2007 (H.R. 5441)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Subtotal, Personnel compensation and benefits.....	72,765	81,000	81,000	+8,235	---
Integrated deepwater systems:					
Aircraft:					
Aircraft, other.....	154,440	216,513	216,513	+62,073	---
HH-65 re-engining.....	131,769	32,373	32,373	-99,396	---
Subtotal, Aircraft.....	286,209	248,886	248,886	-37,323	---
Surface ships.....	504,108	498,366	466,786	-37,322	-31,580
C4ISR.....	43,560	60,786	60,786	+17,226	---
Logistics.....	18,612	42,273	32,062	+13,450	-10,211
Systems engineering and integration.....	36,630	35,145	35,145	-1,485	---
Government program management.....	34,650	48,975	48,975	+14,325	---
Subtotal, Integrated deepwater systems.....	923,769	934,431	892,640	-31,129	-41,791
Shore facilities and aids to navigation:					
Shore operational and support projects.....	---	2,600	2,600	+2,600	---
Shore construction projects.....	---	2,850	1,450	+1,450	-1,400
Renovate USCGA Chase Hall barracks, Phase I... ..	14,850	2,000	2,000	-12,850	---
Coast Guard housing - Cordova, AK.....	---	5,500	5,500	+5,500	---
ISC Seattle Group, sector admin ops facility phase II.....	---	2,600	2,600	+2,600	---
Replace multi-purpose building - Group Long Island Sound.....	9,900	1,000	1,000	-8,900	---
Construct breakwater - Station Neah Bay.....	2,772	1,100	1,100	-1,672	---
Rebuild station and waterfront at Base Galveston phase I.....	---	5,200	5,200	+5,200	---
Waterways aids to navigation infrastructure... ..	3,861	3,000	3,000	-861	---
Subtotal, Shore facilities and aids to navigation.....	31,383	25,850	24,450	-6,933	-1,400
P.L. 109-148 (emergency).....	74,500	---	---	-74,500	---
Subtotal, Acquisition, construction, and improvements.....	1,204,882	1,169,537	1,139,663	-65,219	-29,874
Appropriations.....	(1,130,382)	(1,169,537)	(1,139,663)	(+9,281)	(-29,874)
Emergency appropriations.....	(74,500)	---	---	(-74,500)	---
Alteration of bridges.....	14,850	---	17,000	+2,150	+17,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation.....	17,573	13,860	13,860	-3,713	---
Health care fund contribution.....	---	278,704	278,704	+278,704	---
Subtotal, U.S. Coast Guard discretionary.....	6,660,766	7,116,772	7,065,098	+404,332	-51,674
Retired pay (mandatory).....	1,014,080	1,063,323	1,063,323	+49,243	---
Total, United States Coast Guard.....	7,674,846	8,180,095	8,128,421	+453,575	-51,674
Appropriations.....	(7,743,983)	(8,180,095)	(8,128,421)	(+384,438)	(-51,674)
Emergency appropriations.....	(206,500)	---	---	(-206,500)	---
Rescissions.....	(-275,637)	---	---	(+275,637)	---
(By transfer).....	(100,000)	---	---	(-100,000)	---
United States Secret Service					
Protection, Administration, and Training:					
Protection:					
Protection of persons and facilities.....	570,553	639,747	657,267	+86,714	+17,520
National special security event fund.....	2,475	---	---	-2,475	---
Protective intelligence activities.....	55,653	55,509	61,509	+5,856	+6,000
White House mail screening.....	16,201	16,201	16,201	---	---
Subtotal, Protection.....	644,882	711,457	734,977	+90,095	+23,520

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2007 (H.R. 5441)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Field operations:					
Domestic field operations.....	236,499	236,093	---	-236,499	-236,093
International field office administration and operations.....	20,758	21,616	---	-20,758	-21,616
Electronic crimes special agent program and electronic crimes task forces.....	39,204	44,079	---	-39,204	-44,079
Subtotal, Field operations.....	296,461	301,788	---	-296,461	-301,788
Administration:					
Headquarters, management and administration... National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.....	201,200	169,370	169,370	-31,830	---
	7,810	7,811	---	-7,810	-7,811
Subtotal, Administration.....	209,010	177,181	169,370	-39,640	-7,811
Training:					
Rowley training center.....	45,874	50,052	50,052	+4,178	---
Emergency appropriations (P. L. 109-148).....	3,600	---	---	-3,600	---
Subtotal, Protection, Admin and Training.....	1,199,827	1,240,478	954,399	-245,428	-286,079
Appropriations.....	(1,199,827)	(1,240,478)	(954,399)	(-241,828)	(-286,079)
Emergency appropriations.....	(3,600)	---	---	(-3,600)	---
Investigations and Field Operations:					
Domestic field operations.....	---	---	236,093	+236,093	+236,093
International field administration and operations.....	---	---	24,516	+24,516	+24,516
Electronic crimes special agent program and electronic crimes task forces.....	---	---	44,079	+44,079	+44,079
Forensic support and grants to NCMEC.....	---	---	7,811	+7,811	+7,811
Subtotal, Investigations and Field operations....	---	---	312,499	+312,499	+312,499
Special Event Fund:					
National special security event fund.....	---	2,500	2,500	+2,500	---
Candidate nominee protection (equip and training).....	---	18,400	18,400	+18,400	---
Subtotal, Special Event Fund.....	---	20,900	20,900	+20,900	---
Acquisition, construction, improvements and related expenses (Rowley training center).....					
	3,662	3,725	3,725	+63	---
Total, United States Secret Service.....					
	1,203,489	1,265,103	1,291,523	+88,034	+26,420
Appropriations.....	(1,199,889)	(1,265,103)	(1,291,523)	(+91,634)	(+26,420)
Emergency appropriations.....	(3,600)	---	---	(-3,600)	---
Total, title II, Security, Enforcement, and Investigations.....					
	22,164,851	22,670,507	23,705,970	+1,541,119	+1,035,463
Appropriations.....	(22,182,888)	(22,670,507)	(23,705,970)	(+1,523,082)	(+1,035,463)
Emergency appropriations.....	(257,600)	---	---	(-257,600)	---
Rescission.....	(-275,637)	---	---	(+275,637)	---
(By transfer).....	(100,000)	---	---	(-100,000)	---
(Fee Accounts).....	(1,575,698)	(1,593,681)	(1,593,681)	(+17,983)	---

TITLE III - PREPAREDNESS AND RECOVERY

Preparedness

Under Secretary for Preparedness:

Immediate Office of the Under Secretary.....	13,055	17,497	17,497	+4,442	---
Office of the Chief Medical Officer.....	1,980	4,980	4,980	+3,000	---
Office of National Capital Region Coordination....	883	1,991	1,991	+1,108	---
National Preparedness Integration Coordination....	---	50,000	15,000	+15,000	-35,000
Subtotal, Under Secretary for Preparedness.. . .	15,918	74,468	39,468	+23,550	-35,000

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2007 (H.R. 5441)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Grants and Training:					
Management and Administration.....	4,950	5,000	---	-4,950	-5,000
State and Local Programs:					
State Homeland Security Grant Program:					
State and Local Basic Formula Grants.....	544,500	633,000	545,000	+500	-88,000
Citizen Corps.....	---	35,000	---	---	-35,000
Subtotal, State Homeland Security Grant Program.....	544,500	668,000	545,000	+500	-123,000
Law enforcement terrorism prevention grants...	396,000	---	400,000	+4,000	+400,000
Discretionary grants:					
High-threat, high-density urban area.....	757,350	838,000	750,000	-7,350	-88,000
Targeted infrastructure protection.....	---	600,000	---	---	-600,000
Buffer zone protection program.....	49,500	---	50,000	+500	+50,000
Port security grants.....	173,250	---	200,000	+26,750	+200,000
Rail and transit security.....	148,500	---	150,000	+1,500	+150,000
Trucking security grants.....	4,950	---	5,000	+50	+5,000
Intercity bus security grants.....	9,900	---	10,000	+100	+10,000
Subtotal, Discretionary grants.....	1,143,450	1,438,000	1,165,000	+21,550	-273,000
Commercial equipment direct assistance program	49,500	---	75,000	+25,500	+75,000
National Programs:					
National Domestic Preparedness Consortium.	143,550	89,351	135,000	-8,550	+45,649
National exercise program.....	51,480	48,708	49,000	-2,480	+292
Technical assistance.....	19,800	11,500	25,000	+5,200	+13,500
Metropolitan Medical Response System.....	29,700	---	30,000	+300	+30,000
Demonstration training grants.....	29,700	---	30,000	+300	+30,000
Continuing training grants.....	24,750	3,000	35,000	+10,250	+32,000
Citizen Corps.....	19,800	---	---	-19,800	---
Evaluations and assessments.....	14,157	23,000	23,000	+8,843	---
Rural Domestic Preparedness Consortium....	9,900	---	12,000	+2,100	+12,000
Subtotal, National Programs.....	342,837	175,559	339,000	-3,837	+163,441
Subtotal, State and Local Programs.....	2,476,287	2,281,559	2,524,000	+47,713	+242,441
Firefighter Assistance Grants:					
Grants.....	539,550	293,450	500,000	-39,550	+206,550
Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) Act.....	108,900	---	40,000	-68,900	+40,000
Subtotal, Firefighter Assistance Grants.	648,450	293,450	540,000	-108,450	+246,550
Emergency management performance grants.....	183,150	170,000	186,000	+2,850	+16,000
Supplemental appropriations (PL 109-148,emergency)	10,300	---	---	-10,300	---
Subtotal, Grants and Training.....	3,323,137	2,750,009	3,250,000	-73,137	+499,991
Appropriations.....	(3,312,837)	(2,750,009)	(3,250,000)	(-62,837)	(+499,991)
Emergency appropriations.....	(10,300)	---	---	(-10,300)	---
Radiological Emergency Preparedness Program.....	-1,266	-477	-477	+789	---
U.S. Fire Administration and Training:					
United States Fire Administration.....	40,037	40,887	40,887	+850	---
Noble Training Center.....	4,462	5,962	5,962	+1,500	---
Subtotal, U.S. Fire Administration and Training.	44,499	46,849	46,849	+2,350	---
Infrastructure Protection and Information Security					
Management and administration.....	82,509	84,650	84,650	+2,141	---
Critical infrastructure outreach and partnership.....	111,055	101,100	101,100	-9,955	---
Critical infrastructure identification and evaluation.....	67,815	71,631	71,631	+3,816	---

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2007 (H.R. 5441)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
National Infrastructure Simulation and					
Analysis Center.....	19,800	16,021	16,021	-3,779	---
Biosurveillance.....	13,959	8,218	8,218	-5,741	---
Protective actions.....	90,485	32,043	32,043	-58,442	---
Cyber security.....	92,416	92,205	92,205	-211	---
National Security/Emergency Preparedness					
Telecommunications.....	141,206	143,272	143,272	+2,066	---
Subtotal, Infrastructure Protection and Information Security.....					
	619,245	549,140	549,140	-70,105	---
Total, Preparedness.....					
Appropriations.....	4,001,533	3,419,989	3,884,980	-116,553	+464,991
Emergency appropriations.....	(3,991,233)	(3,419,989)	(3,884,980)	(-106,253)	(+464,991)
	(10,300)	---	---	(-10,300)	---
Counterterrorism Fund					
Counterterrorism fund.....	1,980	---	---	-1,980	---
Federal Emergency Management Agency					
Administrative and regional operations.....					
Defense function.....	171,508	206,259	205,259	+33,751	-1,000
Supplemental appropriations (PL 109-148,emergency)	47,520	49,240	49,240	+1,720	---
	17,200	---	---	-17,200	---
Subtotal, Administrative and regional operations					
Appropriations.....	236,228	255,499	254,499	+18,271	-1,000
Emergency appropriations.....	(219,028)	(255,499)	(254,499)	(+35,471)	(-1,000)
	(17,200)	---	---	(-17,200)	---
Readiness, mitigation, response, and recovery:					
Operating activities.....	182,217	213,682	218,382	+36,165	+4,700
Urban search and rescue teams.....	19,800	19,817	19,817	+17	---
Subtotal, Readiness, mitigation, response, and recovery.....					
	202,017	233,499	238,199	+36,182	+4,700
Public health programs.....	33,660	33,885	33,885	+225	---
Disaster relief.....					
Transfer out (emergency).....	1,752,300	1,941,390	1,662,891	-89,409	-278,499
	(-1,500)	---	---	(+1,500)	---
Subtotal, Disaster Relief.....					
	1,750,800	1,941,390	1,662,891	-87,909	-278,499
Rescission of emergency funding (P.L. 109-148)....	-23,409,300	---	---	+23,409,300	---
Disaster assistance direct loan program account:					
Limitation on direct loans.....	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses.....	561	569	569	+8	---
Transfer in (emergency).....	(1,500)	---	---	(-1,500)	---
Flood map modernization fund.....	198,000	198,980	198,980	+980	---
National flood insurance fund:					
Salaries and expenses.....	36,496	38,230	38,230	+1,734	---
Flood hazard mitigation.....	87,358	90,358	90,358	+3,000	---
Offsetting fee collections.....	-123,854	-128,588	-128,588	-4,734	---
Transfer to National flood mitigation fund.....	(-28,000)	(-31,000)	(-31,000)	(-3,000)	---
National flood mitigation fund (by transfer).....	(28,000)	(31,000)	(31,000)	(+3,000)	---
National pre-disaster mitigation fund.....	49,500	149,978	100,000	+50,500	-49,978
Emergency food and shelter.....	151,470	151,470	151,470	---	---
Total, FEMA (excluding resc of emerg approp)....					
Appropriations.....	2,623,736	2,965,270	2,640,493	+16,757	-324,777
Emergency appropriations.....	(2,606,536)	(2,965,270)	(2,640,493)	(+33,957)	(-324,777)
Rescission of emergency appropriations.....	(17,200)	---	---	(-17,200)	---
	-23,409,300	---	---	+23,409,300	---
Total, title III, Preparedness and Recovery (excluding resc of emerg approp).....					
	6,627,249	6,385,259	6,525,473	-101,776	+140,214

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2007 (H.R. 5441)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Appropriations.....	(6,599,749)	(6,385,259)	(6,525,473)	(-74,276)	(+140,214)
Emergency appropriations.....	(27,500)	---	---	(-27,500)	---
Rescission of emergency appropriations.....	-23,409,300	---	---	+23,409,300	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	---	---
(Transfer out) (including emergency).....	(-29,500)	(-31,000)	(-31,000)	(-1,500)	---
(By transfer) (including emergency).....	(29,500)	(31,000)	(31,000)	(+1,500)	---
=====					
TITLE IV - RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, TRAINING, AND SERVICES					
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services					
Backlog reduction initiative:					
Contracting services.....	69,300	---	---	-69,300	---
Other.....	9,900	---	---	-9,900	---
Digitization and IT transformation.....	34,650	---	---	-34,650	---
Subtotal, Backlog reduction initiative.....	113,850	---	---	-113,850	---
Salaries and expenses:					
Business transformation and IT transformation....	---	47,000	47,000	+47,000	---
Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE).....	---	24,500	24,500	+24,500	---
Employment Eligibility Verification (EEV) program.....	---	110,490	90,490	+90,490	-20,000
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses.....	---	181,990	161,990	+161,990	-20,000
Adjudication services (fee account):					
Pay and benefits.....	(657,000)	(624,600)	(624,600)	(-32,400)	---
District operations.....	(349,000)	(385,400)	(385,400)	(+36,400)	---
Service center operations.....	(250,000)	(267,000)	(267,000)	(+17,000)	---
Asylum, refugee and international operations	(74,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(+1,000)	---
Records operations.....	(66,000)	(67,000)	(67,000)	(+1,000)	---
Subtotal, Adjudication services.....	(1,396,000)	(1,419,000)	(1,419,000)	(+23,000)	---
Information and customer services (fee account):					
Pay and benefits.....	(80,000)	(81,000)	(81,000)	(+1,000)	---
Operating expenses:					
National Customer Service Center.....	(47,000)	(48,000)	(48,000)	(+1,000)	---
Information services.....	(14,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)	(+1,000)	---
Subtotal, Information and customer services.....	(141,000)	(144,000)	(144,000)	(+3,000)	---
Administration (fee account):					
Pay and benefits.....	(44,000)	(45,000)	(45,000)	(+1,000)	---
Operating expenses.....	(193,000)	(196,000)	(196,000)	(+3,000)	---
Subtotal, Administration.....	(237,000)	(241,000)	(241,000)	(+4,000)	---
=====					
Total, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services	(1,887,850)	(1,985,990)	(1,965,990)	(+78,140)	(-20,000)
Appropriations.....	(113,850)	(181,990)	(161,990)	(+48,140)	(-20,000)
(Immigration Examination Fee Account).....	(1,730,000)	(1,760,000)	(1,760,000)	(+30,000)	---
(Fraud prevention and detection fee account)	(31,000)	(31,000)	(31,000)	---	---
(H1B Non-Immigrant Petitioner fee account).....	(13,000)	(13,000)	(13,000)	---	---
=====					
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center					
Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries and expenses.....	192,060	---	---	-192,060	---
Law enforcement training.....	---	201,020	209,217	+209,217	+8,197
Accreditation.....	---	1,290	1,290	+1,290	---
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses.....	192,060	202,310	210,507	+18,447	+8,197

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2007 (H.R. 5441)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Acquisition, Construction, Improvements, and Related expenses:					
Direct appropriation.....	87,474	42,246	42,246	-45,228	---
Total, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center..	279,534	244,556	252,753	-26,781	+8,197
Science and Technology					
Management and administration:					
Office of the Under Secretary for Science and Technology.....	6,414	7,594	7,594	+1,180	---
Other salaries and expenses.....	73,874	188,307	173,307	+99,433	-15,000
Subtotal, Management and administration.....	80,288	195,901	180,901	+100,613	-15,000
Research, development, acquisition, and operations:					
Biological countermeasures:					
Operating expenses.....	23,067	---	---	-23,067	---
Defense function.....	353,133	337,200	337,200	-15,933	---
Subtotal, Biological countermeasures....	376,200	337,200	337,200	-39,000	---
Chemical countermeasures.....	94,050	83,092	45,092	-48,958	-38,000
Explosives countermeasures.....	43,560	86,582	76,582	+33,022	-10,000
Threat awareness.....	42,570	39,851	39,851	-2,719	---
Conventional missions in support of DHS.....	79,200	88,622	85,622	+6,422	-3,000
Rapid prototyping program.....	34,650	---	---	-34,650	---
Standards.....	34,650	22,131	22,131	-12,519	---
Emerging threats.....	7,920	---	---	-7,920	---
Emergent and prototypical technology.....	---	19,451	19,451	+19,451	---
Critical infrastructure protection.....	40,392	15,413	35,413	-4,979	+20,000
University programs/fellowship program.....	62,370	51,970	51,970	-10,400	---
Counter MANPADs.....	108,900	4,880	4,880	-104,020	---
Safety act.....	6,930	4,710	4,710	-2,220	---
Cyber security.....	16,533	22,733	22,733	+6,200	---
Office of interoperability and compatibility.....	26,235	29,735	29,735	+3,500	---
Research and development consolidation.....	98,898	---	---	-98,898	---
Radiological and nuclear countermeasures.....	18,895	---	---	-18,895	---
Domestic Nuclear Detection Office.....	314,834	---	---	-314,834	---
Subtotal, Research, development, acquisition, and operations.....	1,406,787	806,370	775,370	-631,417	-31,000
Total, Science and Technology.....	1,487,075	1,002,271	956,271	-530,804	-46,000
Domestic Nuclear Detection Office					
Management and administration.....	---	30,468	30,468	+30,468	---
Research, development, and operations.....	---	327,320	291,532	+291,532	-35,788
Systems acquisition.....	---	178,000	178,000	+178,000	---
Subtotal, Domestic Nuclear Detection Office....	---	535,788	500,000	+500,000	-35,788
Total, title IV, Research and Development, Training, and Services.....	1,880,459	1,964,605	1,871,014	-9,445	-93,591
(Fee Accounts).....	(1,774,000)	(1,804,000)	(1,804,000)	(+30,000)	---

TITLE V - GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 521:					
Rescission, Fast Reponse Cutter (P.L. 109-90).....	---	---	-79,347	-79,347	-79,347
110ft Island Class Patrol Boat procurement or refurbishment.....	---	---	79,347	+79,347	+79,347
Sec. 527 (FY06):					
Rescission, 110-to-123 Conversions (P.L.108-11, P.L. 108-90 and P.L. 108-334).....	-78,631	---	---	+78,631	---

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2007 (H.R. 5441)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs Enacted	Bill vs. Request
110ft Island Class Patrol Boat procurement or refurbishment.....	77,845	---	---	-77,845	---
Sec. 538: REAL ID Grants.....	39,600	---	---	-39,600	---
Rescissions, sec. 542 through 546:					
Sec. 542: Working Capital Fund.....	-15,000	---	---	+15,000	---
Sec. 543: Transportation Security Administration aviation security (P.L. 108-334).....	-5,500	---	---	+5,500	---
Sec. 544: Coast Guard operating expenses and acquisition, construction, and improvements (P.L. 105-277, 106-69, 107-87, and 108-90).....	-6,369	---	---	+6,369	---
Sec. 545: Counterterrorism Fund (P.L. 108-90).....	-8,000	---	---	+8,000	---
Sec. 546: Science and technology research, development, acquisition, and operations (P.L. 108-334).....	-20,000	---	---	+20,000	---
Subtotal, Rescissions, sec. 542 through 546.	-54,869	---	---	+54,869	---
Sec. 527:					
Rescission, Counter Terrorism Fund.....	---	-16,000	-16,000	-16,000	---
Sec. 533:					
Rescission, TSA unobligated balances.....	---	---	-4,776	-4,776	-4,776
Total, title V, General Provisions.....	-16,055	-16,000	-20,776	-4,721	-4,776
Appropriations.....	(117,445)	---	(79,347)	(-38,098)	(+79,347)
Rescissions.....	(-133,500)	(-16,000)	(-100,123)	(+33,377)	(-84,123)
Grand total (including resc of emerg approp)....	8,192,803	32,077,970	33,143,147	+24,950,344	+1,065,177
Appropriations.....	(31,678,857)	(32,093,970)	(33,243,270)	(+1,564,413)	(+1,149,300)
Emergency appropriations.....	(332,383)	---	---	(-332,383)	---
Rescissions.....	(-409,137)	(-16,000)	(-100,123)	(+309,014)	(-84,123)
Rescission of emergency appropriations..	(-23,409,300)	---	---	(+23,409,300)	---
Fee funded programs.....	(3,349,698)	(3,397,681)	(3,397,681)	(+47,983)	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	---	---
(Transfer out) (including emergency).....	(-29,500)	(-31,000)	(-31,000)	(-1,500)	---
(By transfer) (including emergency).....	(129,500)	(31,000)	(31,000)	(-98,500)	---

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP

Scorekeeping adjustments:					
Emergency appropriations.....	23,076,917	---	---	-23,076,917	---
Scoring adjustment (for 1% ATB rescission).....	2,060	---	---	-2,060	---
Total, scorekeeping adjustments.....	23,078,977	---	---	-23,078,977	---
Total (including adjustments).....	31,271,780	32,077,970	33,143,147	+1,871,367	+1,065,177
Amount in this bill.....	(8,192,803)	(32,077,970)	(33,143,147)	(+24,950,344)	(+1,065,177)
Scorekeeping adjustments.....	(23,078,977)	---	---	(-23,078,977)	---
*Total mandatory and discretionary.....	31,271,780	32,077,970	33,143,147	+1,871,367	+1,065,177
Mandatory.....	(1,014,080)	(1,063,323)	(1,063,323)	(+49,243)	---
Discretionary.....	(30,257,700)	(31,014,647)	(32,079,824)	(+1,822,124)	(+1,065,177)
Discretionary Function Recap:					
Non-defense.....	28,669,047	30,288,207	31,353,384	+2,684,337	+1,065,177
Defense.....	1,588,653	726,440	726,440	-862,213	---
Total.....	30,257,700	31,014,647	32,079,824	+1,822,124	+1,065,177

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2007 (H.R. 5441)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY SUMMARY					
TITLE I - DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS					
Departmental operations.....	863,412	977,414	962,281	+98,869	-15,133
Office of the Federal Coordinator for Gulf Coast Rebuilding.....	---	---	3,000	+3,000	+3,000
Office of Inspector General.....	82,187	96,185	96,185	+13,998	---
Total, title I.....	945,599	1,073,599	1,061,466	+115,867	-12,133
TITLE II - SECURITY, ENFORCEMENT, AND INVESTIGATIONS					
U.S. Visitor and Immigrant Status Indication Technology	336,600	399,494	362,494	+25,894	-37,000
Customs and border protection.....	7,069,704	7,839,113	7,700,334	+630,630	-138,779
Direct appropriations.....	(5,893,058)	(6,573,882)	(6,435,103)	(+542,045)	(-138,779)
Fee accounts.....	(1,142,146)	(1,265,231)	(1,265,231)	(+123,085)	---
Immigration and customs enforcement.....	3,409,996	4,180,921	4,121,887	+711,891	-59,034
Direct appropriations.....	(3,643,444)	(4,444,583)	(4,385,549)	(+742,105)	(-59,034)
Offsetting fee collections.....	(-487,000)	(-516,011)	(-516,011)	(-29,011)	---
Fee accounts.....	(253,552)	(252,349)	(252,349)	(-1,203)	---
Transportation Security Administration.....	3,865,914	2,323,361	3,618,891	-247,023	+1,295,530
Direct appropriations.....	(5,855,914)	(5,973,361)	(6,038,891)	(+182,977)	(+65,530)
Offsetting fee collections.....	(-1,990,000)	(-3,650,000)	(-2,420,000)	(-430,000)	(+1,230,000)
United States Coast Guard.....	7,674,846	8,180,095	8,128,421	+453,575	-51,674
United States Secret Service.....	1,203,489	1,265,103	1,291,523	+88,034	+26,420
Total, title II, direct appropriations.....	22,164,851	22,670,507	23,705,970	+1,541,119	+1,035,463
TITLE III - PREPAREDNESS AND RECOVERY					
Preparedness Directorate.....	4,001,533	3,419,989	3,884,980	-116,553	+464,991
Counterterrorism fund.....	1,980	---	---	-1,980	---
Federal Emergency Management Agency.....	2,623,736	2,965,270	2,640,493	+16,757	-324,777
Direct appropriations.....	(2,606,536)	(2,965,270)	(2,640,493)	(+33,957)	(-324,777)
Emergency appropriations.....	(17,200)	---	---	(-17,200)	---
Offsetting fee collections.....	(-123,854)	(-128,588)	(-128,588)	(-4,734)	---
Total, title III.....	6,627,249	6,385,259	6,525,473	-101,776	+140,214
TITLE IV - RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, TRAINING, AND SERVICES					
Citizenship and immigration services.....	1,887,850	1,985,990	1,965,990	+78,140	-20,000
Direct appropriations.....	(113,850)	(181,990)	(161,990)	(+48,140)	(-20,000)
Fee accounts.....	(1,774,000)	(1,804,000)	(1,804,000)	(+30,000)	---
Federal law enforcement training center.....	279,534	244,556	252,753	-26,781	+8,197
Science and technology.....	1,487,075	1,002,271	956,271	-530,804	-46,000
*Defense Nuclear Detection Office.....	---	535,788	500,000	+500,000	-35,788
Total, title IV, direct appropriations.....	1,880,459	1,964,605	1,871,014	-9,445	-93,591
TITLE V - GENERAL PROVISIONS					
General provisions.....	-16,055	-16,000	-20,776	-4,721	-4,776
Scorekeeping adjustments.....	23,078,977	---	---	-23,078,977	---
TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.....	31,271,780	32,077,970	33,143,147	+1,871,367	+1,065,177

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his kind comments. It has been a privilege to work with you over these last 6 years; the first 2 years in the well-established Transportation Committee, the last 4 years in the brand new endeavor of Homeland Security, with the whole process of building and trying to help a new agency get going.

I have found you a great person to work with. I have the utmost respect for you. You are a real pro. You know what you are doing. And so I have great respect and admiration for the work that you do.

I would much rather have had a different role than being ranking member, but at the same time that I am expressing my gratitude to you, I also spent 4 years with Mr. WOLF on the Transportation Committee, and I found him also a very good person to work with, a person like you, open to suggestions from the minority, and a real pro in handling the transportation bill that I did with Mr. WOLF.

So despite my wishes that the roles would have been reversed, it has been a real privilege and honor to work with you. Also, throughout that time, we have had great staff to work with. On my side, Bev Pheto, from our minority staff; Marge Duske from my personal staff; and Chris Martin, who also has been with our committee, who has been great to work with; Mr. OBEY, the ranking member of the full committee, who I have worked with closely; and on the majority staff, Michelle, who I expect you will be talking about her future, who has done a great job; and Stephanie, who I not only had a chance to work with on Homeland Security but worked with in Transportation before that; and Ted; and Jeff; and Ben; and Brett; and Kelly; and Will; and Meg; thank you to all of the staff. It is an excellent professional staff that we can all be proud of.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABO. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments, especially about the staff. We would not be here obviously without the hard work that they have put into this bill. You and I are just sort of front people for the real work that goes on behind the scenes by staff.

So we do have, I think, the best staff in the business on both sides of the aisle. I join you in complimenting the staff. You may notice that all of the staff is wearing some form of purple in their clothing at some point in time. And there is a reason for that.

Purple is the favorite color of Michelle Mrdeza, who as we all know is retiring after this year from her labors. And so we are paying tribute to Michelle with purple. We wish Michelle well in her next life as well.

□ 1600

She has rendered tremendous service to her country. In trying to stand up this brand-new Department, the biggest reorganization in the government at least since 1948, in standing up this Department it has been real labor, toils and snares all along the way and they continue until this today. But Michelle and the staff of the subcommittee on both sides have just been marvelous in this labor of love of trying to stand up this huge agency, that we owe them more than we can ever tell them about. But that goes for the ranking member, too.

He has been a marvelous help-mate as we struggled along trying to find our way through a thicket to try to stand up this brand-new Department. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SABO. I thank the chairman for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate Chairman ROGERS on this homeland security bill which is clearly better than the administration's budget request.

The President's proposed new fees and unrealistic discretionary budget cap left the Appropriations Committee with big holes to fill. As a result there are difficult homeland security funding choices to make. My concerns about our Nation's homeland security are not limited to funding. As I have said before, I had serious doubts in 2002 about the wisdom of creating a new Department of Homeland Security, and I voted against the bill. When I took on the role of ranking member on the subcommittee, I decided my job was to try and prove myself wrong. I'm sorry to say that the DHS bureaucrat mess is worse than I first imagined, and I still cannot say that my original judgment was wrong.

There is modest progress in some areas. However, time and again we see failures of planning, leadership and management at DHS. Americans are holding their breath as a new hurricane season approaches. And 8 months into the fiscal year, the States in the high-threat urban areas are still waiting for DHS to release hundreds of millions of dollars in 2006 homeland grants. We regularly see broad pronouncement from DHS without the proper detail or budgets to support them.

The new Secure Border Initiative is a perfect example. It appears that the administration SBInet plan is to hire private industry to think for us how to develop border security technology and systems and then sell us the solutions to them.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate Chairman ROGERS on this homeland security bill which is clearly better than the Administration's budget request. The President's proposed new fees and an unrealistic discretionary budget cap left the Appropriations Committee with big holes to fill. As a result, there are difficult homeland security funding choices to make.

My concerns about our nation's homeland security are not limited to funding. As I have said before, I had serious doubts in 2002 about the wisdom of creating a new Depart-

ment of Homeland Security, and I voted against it. When I took on the role of ranking member on the Subcommittee, I decided that my job was to prove myself wrong. I'm sorry to say that the DHS bureaucratic mess is worse than I first imagined, and I still can't say that my original judgment was wrong.

There is modest progress in some areas. However, time and again, we see failures of planning, leadership and management at DHS. Americans are holding their breath as a new hurricane season approaches. And, eight months into the fiscal year, the states and high-threat urban areas are still waiting for DHS to release hundreds of millions of dollars in '06 homeland grants.

We regularly see broad policy announcements from DHS without the proper detail or budgets to support them. The new Secure Border Initiative is a perfect example. It appears that the Administration's SBInet "plan" is to hire private industry to think for us on how to develop border security technology and systems, and then sell us the solution they come up with.

Most recently, Mr. OBEY and I asked GAO to look at how DHS is handling personal information in its ADVISE program. We have long been concerned about how the Department treats Americans' privacy and due process rights. ADVISE appears to be a new variation on the highly controversial Defense Department Total Information Awareness program, that was supposed to be terminated in 2003.

Regarding funding levels in this bill, my biggest reservations are about the fire grants, port and transit security and state training grant programs. Some of these programs are funded at last year's level, and some are below.

I am particularly concerned about fire grants, which is one of the most successful programs that the Department administers. This bill cuts fire grants by \$109 million, or 17 percent, below 2006. Our nation's firefighters have great needs that cannot be met at the funding level in this bill. I will offer an amendment later to restore fire grant and SAFER funding to slightly above the FY06 level.

We still have serious gaps in air cargo security. This bill makes no real headway in closing them, and port security grant funding is also lower than I would like to see.

This bill does not fund all of the additional border patrol agents and detention beds called for in the President's February budget request. Since his speech last week, we are still trying to understand the new initiatives—and the costs—that the President proposes.

You can be sure, however, that the price tag for meaningful border security and immigration services and enforcement will be very steep. It will be far more than the roughly \$19.4 billion in this bill (9 percent above 2006) that is attributed to border security and immigration.

As an example, individuals in my district—and I suspect yours—have waited more than two years for the federal government to run security name checks to process their immigration paperwork. These people are doing things legally. As far as I can tell, the funding the President proposes in his new plan won't address this issue. I can only imagine the size of the backlog that would be created by his plan or other significant changes in immigration law.

I make these observations not to criticize the Chairman. I simply want to clarify for

Members that even though this bill increases homeland security funding, it does not get us where we need to be in protecting the nation.

Lastly, I am very concerned that—nearly 5 years after 9/11—the federal government is still failing to secure the vast majority of chemical facilities in this country. They are prime targets for a catastrophic terrorist attack, and there is precious little being done to protect many of them.

The administration acknowledges the chemical security dilemma we face, but will not act without new legal authority to make and enforce chemical security regulations. The Congress—for more than four years—has failed to act. Competing legislation in the House and Senate authorizing committees has gone nowhere. What are we waiting for?

I was very disappointed that the Rules Committee refused to protect my chemical security language—Section 536—which was added to this bill in the Appropriations Committee. These provisions would give DHS the legal authority that Secretary Chertoff says he needs to regulate U.S. chemical facilities that pose the greatest risk to Americans.

Congress addressed a small part of the chemical security problem in 2002. We enacted security requirements for chemical facilities on ports under the Maritime Transportation Security Act, and the Coast Guard is doing a good job of enforcing them. Under the Bioterrorism Act of 2002, the EPA also oversees security at the nation's drinking water facilities. Section 536 would not re-regulate them.

The problem is that there are thousands of other chemical plants and storage facilities without federal security standards or oversight. An attack on one of them has the potential to kill or injure tens of thousands of people. DHS has said that 20 percent of the 3,400 chemical facilities it identifies as "high-risk" adhere to no security guidelines. Yet, Congress appears content to leave security at these facilities to the good conscience of their operators.

I urge my colleagues to refrain from making a point of order against the chemical security provisions in this bill. The American people have waited too long for Congress to take responsible action to prevent a catastrophic attack on a chemical facility.

If the Congress produces chemical security legislation that the President can sign into law this year, then the Section 536 would be unnecessary. I suspect, however, that Congress will adjourn without doing so. And then—without Section 536—where will we be? Will the American people have to endure another year without chemical security protections?

In closing, I will say that this is not a perfect bill. Given the allocation provided, however, it is one that I will support.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), the distinguished chairman of the authorizing Committee on Homeland Security in the House.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky who has been a leader in strengthening the Department and providing crucial oversight to its activities. I want to thank you and Ranking Member SABO for your hard work on this bill, and of course join with you in commending Mr. SABO in his many years of dedication to this Chamber.

This bill provides the necessary resources for the Federal Government's effort to protect the homeland. I rise to acknowledge a number of legislative provisions that are included in the bill and fall within the primary jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security. I do not seek to challenge the vast majority of these authorizing provisions, as I believe they are largely necessary to ensure the Department continues to improve its effectiveness. However, I do want to point out the strong jurisdictional interests of the Committee on Homeland Security.

As you know, the Committee on Homeland Security is actively working to advance much needed legislation specifically authorizing many of the activities of the Department, particularly in the areas of border security, cargo security, emergency management, and chemical site security. The Committee on Homeland Security will also in the near future advance a broad reauthorization bill for the Department.

A full list of my concerns is provided in a letter to the gentleman from Kentucky, which will follow my remarks.

Since I became chairman last year, we have had an excellent working relationship, and I appreciate the gentleman from Kentucky's efforts to include me and my staff as you develop the bill. In light of the ongoing authorization activities of the Committee on Homeland Security, I respectfully request your commitment to work together to ensure that the legislative provisions in the homeland security appropriations bill compliment and do not conflict with parallel authorizing legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to thank the gentleman for his efforts to work with our subcommittee and commend him for his leadership in the Committee on Homeland Security. I also appreciate the opportunity to work with the gentleman on legislative provisions contained in the homeland security bill.

As this bill moves forward towards conference, I want to assure the gentleman that I am committed to retaining the key oversight provisions included in this bill. I also look forward to working with the gentleman to ensure that measures consistent with the legislative agenda of the Committee on Homeland Security, particularly in the areas of border, immigration and port security, emergency preparedness and chemical site security. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KING of New York. I thank the gentleman for his commitment. And on a personal note, I want to thank him for the extraordinary cooperation he has given me during the 9 months I have been chairman of the authorizing committee.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, May 25, 2006.

Hon. HAROLD ROGERS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Homeland Security,
Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of
Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROGERS: The House of Representatives has scheduled for consideration today, H.R. 5441, the Homeland Security Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2007. This measure contains a number of legislative provisions that are in violation of House Rule XXI, clause 2, which prohibits legislation within a general appropriation bill. These provisions fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security. While I want to make clear the Committee on Homeland Security's strong jurisdictional interests in the legislative provisions summarized below, I do not intend to assert procedural objections to the vast majority of these provisions during House consideration of the Homeland Security Appropriations Bill.

As you know, the Committee on Homeland Security is actively working to advance legislation specifically authorizing many of the activities of the Department of Homeland Security, particularly in the area of border security, cargo security, emergency management and chemical site security. The Committee on Homeland Security will also, in the near future, advance a broad reauthorization bill for the Department. In light of the ongoing authorization activities of the Committee, I respectfully request your commitment to work together to ensure that the Appropriations Bill complements, and does not conflict with, parallel authorizing legislation.

The provisions of interest to the Committee on Homeland Security are as follows:

Title I, Departmental Management and Operations (Page 2, Line 16–Page 3, Line 2); withholds \$10,000,000 until the Secretary of Homeland Security submits a comprehensive port, container, and cargo security strategic plan to Appropriations and Homeland Committees. This plan must require screening of all inbound cargo, double the percentage of inbound cargo currently inspected, set minimum standards for security inbound cargo and includes the FY 2007 performance requirements for port, container, and cargo security.

Title I, Departmental Management and Operations (Page 3, Lines 2–15); provides that the Secretary of Homeland Security must submit a multi-year strategic plan for the Secure Border Initiative that includes a comprehensive mission statement, an identification of long-term goals, an explanation of how long-term goals will be achieved, schedule and resource requirements, an identification of annual performance goals and how they link to long-term goals, an identification of annual performance measures used to gauge effectiveness towards goal achievement by goal and an identification of major capital assets critical to program success.

Title I, Departmental Management and Operations (Page 4, Line 8–12); provides that \$10,000,000 will be withheld until the Office of Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Homeland Security submits monthly budget execution report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

Title I, Departmental Management and Operations (Page 4, Line 25–Page 5, Line 4); provides that none of the funds in this section may be used for US-VISIT or ACE.

Title II, U.S. Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology (Page 6, Line 12–Page 7, Line 14); withholds \$312,494,000 until the Secretary of Homeland Security submits a plan for expenditures to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees that must

comply with the Department of Homeland Security and procurement regulations, includes a certification by the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Homeland Security and is reviewed by the Department of Homeland Security Investment Review Board and the Government Accountability Office.

Title II, Security, Enforcement, Investigations, Customs and Border Protection, Salaries and Expenses account (page 8, Line 17–Page 9, Line 3); notwithstanding any other provisions of law, this section requires that no funds may be provided for Customs and Border Patrol overtime, from any source, if the funds exceed the \$35,000 cap, except for specific circumstances determined by Secretary of Homeland Security or his designee.

Title II, Security, Enforcement, Investigations, Customs and Border Protection, Salaries and Expenses account (Page 9, Line 6–10); requires the Border Patrol to relocate its checkpoints in the Tucson sector at least once every seven days.

Title II, Security, Enforcement, Investigations, Customs and Border Protection, Automation Modernization account (Page 11, Line 8–Page 12, Line 9); withholds funds provided for the Automated Commercial Environment until the Appropriations Committee receives an expenditure plan on the program meeting certain requirements and is reviewed by the Government Accountability Office.

Title II, Security, Enforcement, Investigations, Customs and Border Protection, Air and Marine Interdiction, Operations, Maintenance, and Procurement account (Page 13, Lines 2–11); prohibits the transfer of any Customs and Border Protection aircraft or equipment to any other Federal agency without approval of the House Appropriations Committee.

Title II, Security, Enforcement, Investigations, Customs and Border Protection, Air and Marine Interdiction, Operations, Maintenance, and Procurement account (Page 13 Lines 11–16); withholds \$6.8 million until the House Appropriations and Homeland Security Committees receive a report on the April 25, 2006 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle mishap.

Title II, Security, Enforcement, Investigations, Customs and Border Protection, Salaries and Expenses account (Page 14, Line 24–Page 15, Line 5); waives other laws and states that no funds may be provided for Customs and Border Protection overtime, from any source, if the funds exceed the \$35,000 cap, except for specific circumstances determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security or his designee.

Title II, Transportation Security Administration, Aviation Security (Page 17, Line 1–11); restricts the Government share of costs of projects to 75 percent for medium or large hub airport and 90 percent for any other airport.

Title II, Transportation Security Administration, Aviation Security Account (Page 17, Lines 11–20); provides that no funding shall be provided except for items such as air cargo inspectors, canines and screeners until a detailed air security action plan that includes the criteria outlined in the Bill is submitted to the House Appropriations and Homeland Security Committees.

Title II, Transportation Security Administration, Transportation Security Support Account (Page 18, Line 23–Page 19, Line 6); withholds \$5 million until the Department of Homeland Security submits a plan for explosive detection systems deployment and spending plan.

Title III, Under Secretary for Preparedness (Page 28, Lines 12–17); withholds \$4.4 million until the Secretary of Homeland Security submits the final National Preparedness Goal to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

Title III, (Page 28, Line 18–Page 31, Line 19); provides that “notwithstanding any other provision of law,” grants to State and local governments for terrorism prevention activities shall be allocated as follows: applications for formula-based grants and law enforcement terrorism prevention grants; no less than 80 percent of any formula-based grant and law enforcement terrorism prevention grant awarded to a State shall be made available by the State to local governments within 60 days after the receipt of the funds; discretionary grants for port security shall be limited to \$200 million and distributed based on risks and threat; discretionary grants for high-threat, high-density urban areas shall be limited to \$750 million; grants under this section shall be made available to states within 45 of the enactment of this act. States shall submit applications within 90 days of the grant announcement; no less than 80 percent of any discretionary grant awarded to a State shall be made available by the State to local governments within 60 days after the receipt of the funds. The Committee Report also directs the Department to guarantee a 0.75 percent “base” to States under the State Homeland Security Grant Program and Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program, thereby eliminating the Department’s discretion under the USA PATRIOT Act to provide that guarantee as a “true minimum.”

Title III, Infrastructure Protection and Information Security (Page 32, Line 22–Page 34, Line 1); requires that the methodology for collecting fees under this section be fair and equitable and that such fees should reflect the cost of the collection of such fees.

Title III, Infrastructure Protection and Information Security (Page 33, Line 18–Line 22); withholds \$10 million until the Department of Homeland Security releases the National Infrastructure Protection Plan.

Title III, Infrastructure Protection and Information Security (Page 33, Line 22–Page 34, Line 2); withholds \$10 million until the Department of Homeland Security has released its national security strategy for the chemical sector report.

Title IV, Research and Development, Training and Services, Science and Technology, Management and Administration (Page 41, Lines 15–20); withholds \$98 million until the Under Secretary submits a detailed expenditure plan for fiscal year 2007 to the House and Senate Appropriations Committee.

Title IV, Research and Development, Training and Services, Science and Technology, Management and Administration (Page 42, Lines 3–9); withholds \$400 million until the House Appropriations Committee receives and approves a report prepared by the Under Secretary that describes Science and Technology’s progress in areas detailed in the bill.

Title IV, Research and Development, Training and Services (Page 42, line 10–Page 43, line 3); provides \$500,000,000 for necessary expenses of the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, but withholds funds from the Sodium-Iodide Manufacturing Program until DNDO demonstrates that the Advanced Spectroscopic Portals will significantly speed commerce, reduce costs of secondary inspection, or significantly increase sensitivity over current radiation portal monitors.

Section 513 (Page 49, Line 17–Page 51, Line 6); withholds funds for Secure Flight until the Secretary certifies that Government Accountability Office has reported on ten CAPPs II points outlined in Sec. 522(a) in P.L. 108–334.

Section 518 (Page 52, Line 14–17); directs the Secretary of Homeland Security in consultation with industry stakeholders to de-

velop screening standards and protocols to increase the use of explosive detection equipment to screen air cargo.

Section 519 (Page 52, Line 18–Page 53, Line 4); directs the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to use existing explosive detection systems equipment to the greatest extent practicable and to provide quarterly reports on amount of cargo carried on passenger aircraft screened to the House Appropriations Committee. Such reports must be submitted within 45 days of the end of the quarter, each day the reports are late, \$100,000 of funding will be withheld from TSA.

Section 520 (Page 53, Lines 5–10); directs that funds cannot be used to create transportation worker ID cards that do not utilize an existing government production facility.

Section 522 (Page 54, Lines 3–9); directs that no funds may be used for anyone but the Department of Homeland Security Privacy Officer to alter, direct or order changes be made, delay or prohibit the transmission to Congress of any report pursuant to paragraph 6 of such section.

Section 525 (Page 54, Line 24–Page 55, Line 19); requires that Department of Homeland Security declare certain types of information detailed in the bill to be releasable.

Section 526 (Page 55, Lines 20–23); authorizes the Working Capital Fund.

Section 529 (Page 56, Line 23–Page 57, Line 14); requires the Department of Homeland Security Chief Financial Officer to submit a monthly budget execution report including the criteria set forth in the bill. The report must be submitted within 45 days of the close of each month, and must be submitted to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

Section 531 (Page 60, line 21–Page 61, line 2); provides the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office with the authority to distribute funding through grants, cooperative agreements, and other transactions and contracts.

Section 532 provides that no funds may be used by U.S. Customs and Border Protection to prevent individuals importing certain prescription drugs.

Section 536 (Page 62, Lines 1–17), requires the Department of Homeland Security to issue security requirements for chemical facilities that the Department deems highest risk within six months of enactment of the Bill.

While I appreciate your efforts to offer meaningful oversight on the Department of Homeland Security, the Committee on Homeland Security continues to actively pursue its authorizing and oversight responsibilities. I look forward to working with you further on measures to improve effectiveness of the Department. Thank you.

Sincerely,

PETER T. KING,

Chairman.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the ranking member of the authorizing committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me time. I also want to pay tribute to the gentleman before he leaves us. I believe this is your last effort, Mr. SABO. You have been a very, very good person to work with on the committee. I wish you well. I am not sure what the future holds, but I know it is very positive.

Mr. Chairman, in the 3 short years since the Department came into existence, it has been in a constant state of transition and turmoil. Chronically

understaffed at the border and in our airports, the Department has had to execute its critical national security mission without the people and resources it needs.

Time and again the dedicated men and women of the Department of Homeland Security are asked to do more with less. There have been numerous turnovers at the highest level in the Department. In a week from today, the 2006 hurricane season will begin and FEMA is still not fully staffed. The Department also has a significant number of leadership vacancies, including the chief financial officer, the chief privacy officer, the commissioner of customs of border protection, and the Under Secretary of Science and Technology. There are so many "actings" at the Department that the agency might want to start handing out Screen Actor Guild cards.

Seriously, it is no wonder that morale at the Department is practically dead last among all Federal agencies. This bill funds the Department at \$33 billion, 5 percent over last year's funding measure. I am glad that we were able to increase the budget without raising the passenger ticket tax, but the level of resources provided is far short of what is needed to make real progress in the war on terror and partner effectively with State and local governments as well as the private sector.

Grants and training programs are funded at \$2.5 billion. That is just 2 percent over what was provided to our communities to train and equip emergency responders last year. At this rate we are not even keeping up with inflation.

This bill also does not fulfill the funding commitments made in the 9/11 act. It does not fund 2,000 more Border Patrol agents. It does not fund 8,000 new detention beds. It does not fund 800 new immigration investigators. No wonder the border, Mr. Chairman, is in crisis.

If we are not willing to fully invest in securing the border permanently, what do we expect? The decision to send our already overtaxed National Guard to the border is a Band-Aid solution to hide the fact that we are failing the good men and women of the Border Patrol, ICE and CBP by not giving them the resources and additional support they need to do their job.

The bulk of my criticism is not for the appropriators. It is for the administration. The parameters for this year's appropriations were dangerously unrealistic. Mr. OBEY attempted to correct this shortfall and infuse another \$3.5 billion into the Department. Had the money been appropriated, the Department would be in better position to meet its responsibilities to the American people.

The Department is in its toddler years, barely out of the terrible twos. It is going to take a significant commitment by this Congress to do the oversight and provide the support need-

ed if the Department is to ever grow into the Federal agency that Congress envisioned and the American people deserve.

Mr. Chairman, I again want to pay tribute to Mr. SABO for guiding us during our terrible twos and threes in this Department. We wish him well.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI).

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman and commend him for demanding from the Department of Homeland Security an in-depth examination of what will work and how we will implement the newest plan to protect our border. But new plan needs to include, as the chairman talked about, a tactical operation, the tactical ability to stretch the border. In other words, we need to get on offense and not take such a passive approach to our issues on the border. We need to be careful that we are not just sitting in a green and white Border Patrol pickup truck, sitting on the border on the night shift, hoping that we picked the right spot, and thinking we will interdict illegals using that kind of an approach.

Mr. Chairman, I grew up in Arizona and my ranch sits within a few miles of the border. On many occasions I have had my fences cut, and I have had many people flow through my ranch headed north. Over the last 18 months, my staff and I have and our team has developed a comprehensive approach to border security called the Red Zone Defense. We currently have 8 aerostat balloons on the border using look-down radar peering into Mexico, stopping the flood of airplanes flowing into America. We need to add sensors that can peer across the line, see them coming, see where they are staging before they get to the border in order to shift the defense, shift the limited amount of manpower we have so we can interdict in a pro-active approach.

Many of my colleagues have embraced this plan. The chairman of the authorization committee, Mr. KING of New York, included it in the authorization bill. And it needs to be part of the financial strategy that is developed by DHS in order to gain operational control of our borders.

Coming from Arizona and living on the border, growing up on the border, we deal with it day in and day out. I ask that DHS, as it begins to move forward in responding to the chairman and the ranking member's demand for a comprehensive plan, look at pro-active intelligence that can cue our limited manpower and can see the illegals coming before they cross the border. We need to have it included in the plan.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) for the purposes of a colloquy with the chairman.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, thank you for this opportunity and for crafting a good bill that supports the critical missions of the Department of

Homeland Security. Within this bill you have done a great job of increasing the amount of Customs and Border Protection and Immigration Customs Enforcement officers and addressing the critical needs along the border.

I am a big supporter that in order to protect the border we have got to start off with optimum staffing levels of law enforcement agencies charged with protecting our borders. This is certainly true in my hometown of Laredo on the border. Your bill goes a long way towards addressing the staffing needs of CBP and ICE in Laredo as well as along our borders through substantive funding increases and extensive planning requirements.

But there is certainly more work to be done, and I hope to be able to work with you, Mr. Chairman, and with your committee on addressing the staffing needs on these agencies, especially along the border in Laredo.

Secondly, there is a serious condition along my area of the border caused by carozo cane. This invasive plant grows wildly along the banks of the Rio Grande and conceals many illegal activities and illegal crossings.

□ 1615

This is why the Riverbend Project in Laredo is so important. I am very appreciative of your supportive report language that reflects my proposed ideas about making the border more secure, and I hope to be able to continue to work with you and the ranking member in the committee to address this problem.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the kind words of the gentleman from Texas, and I share his concerns and am committed to improving our border security and immigration enforcement programs. I know the needs of Laredo are great, but I also know that if we do not address the issue of border security comprehensively, we will continue to throw money at a problem without making measurable gains.

As I have said many times, if our approach is only to build a 20-foot fence, all we end up doing is increasing the demand for 21-foot ladders. We have to have a plan for addressing this very complex and challenging issue.

I will continue to work with the gentleman on his concerns and push the department to plan its work and work its plan.

Mr. CUELLAR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe that the best method to secure our borders is through more law enforcement on the ground; more technology, which is cameras, sensors and air surveillance; and more detention beds.

Again, this bill takes huge strides to address these needs.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the time.

And thank you to Mr. SABO for the great work you have been doing.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) for purposes of a colloquy with the chairman.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of engaging Chairman ROGERS in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for your work on this bill. As the ranking member of the Economic Security, Infrastructure and Cybersecurity Subcommittee of the Homeland Security Committee, I have been working on port security issues for many years, and I was extensively involved in moving the SAFE Port Act that was recently overwhelmingly passed in this House in a very bipartisan manner. One of the topics that we spent a lot of time perfecting in the SAFE Port Act was the authorization of the C-TPAT program.

The reason for this emphasis was that C-TPAT has the potential to be a very effective security program but only if all C-TPAT members are validated to be trustworthy and have adequate supply chain security measures in place. In order to help achieve 100 percent validation, I have been a vocal supporter of third party validations provided the proper controls are in place. The SAFE Port Act requires many safeguards and controls in any third party validation program, including requiring C-TPAT members to contract with third party validators directly and to pay for those validation costs.

So, Mr. Chairman, since both your bill and the SAFE Port Act require 100 percent validations of all C-TPAT participants, I want to clarify that the language regarding third party validators contained within your report will not contradict all of the work of the requirements and the controls that we have put into the SAFE Port Act.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the language in the Homeland Security Appropriations report is intended to support, not change or contradict, the SAFE Port Act's requirements and controls pertaining to third party validators. I share my colleague's concern that C-TPAT is only as good as its participants are credible. We must ensure that all C-TPAT members are validated to have a program that provides real security. That is why our bill aligns with the SAFE Port Act by requiring the validation of all certified participants.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for that clarification and for your strong support for improving the C-TPAT program.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me take my 1 minute to thank Mr. SABO for his great leadership in these very difficult times and to thank him personally for guiding this legislation, along with the chairman. I believe that they attempted to work with what was given to them, of course, suffering from having less than the \$200 million needed to fulfill all of the needs of this legislation.

Finally, I would say that I hope someday that we will pass in appropriations what the 9/11 Commission asked us to do which is to fully fund our border patrol agents with equipment, with power boats, with goggles, and I am grateful for Senator KERRY, who passed that amendment on the Senate side, as we move toward immigration reform, both border security and comprehensive immigration reform.

Again, I thank Chairman ROGERS and I thank Ranking Member SABO for his continued great service and the great work he has done on this legislation. We will certainly miss him, and thank you again.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), a very hardworking member of our subcommittee.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the subcommittee chairman for the time, and Mr. Chairman, I just want to commend the chairman on another great job, very difficult year allocation-wise and everything else and all the hearings. I think it has been extremely informative in keeping the Department's feet to the fire. I think it is extraordinarily important.

I also want to commend my neighbor to the north up in Minnesota, Mr. SABO, and you will be sorely missed next year, that is for sure, and thank you for your great service.

If you notice, I have a purple tie on. I did not get the memo, but Michelle will be missed very much next year, and thank you for the job you have done.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, and I applaud the leadership and the hard work of Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member SABO in bringing this bill to the floor.

I would like to begin by saying that the budget resolution has created inadequacies in this bill from the start. Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member SABO have done a fine job of distributing the scarce funding that is available. They have been able to accomplish this difficult task despite the OMB's use of a proposed new aviation security fee, which was a budgetary gimmick that the Administration knew this Congress would not support and probably did not even support itself.

This fee was yet another attempt by the Administration to fool the American people into thinking that we can pass out money to the wealthy while sinking hundreds of billions into the quagmire in Iraq, and that none of it will

hurt. But again, I want to emphasize that Chairman ROGERS and Mr. SABO are not at fault here.

In fact, I congratulate them for being able to restore much of the funding in this bill for our states and localities, which have always been on the front lines of our battles against terrorism. Mr. Speaker, I understand we have a problem in this government with short attention spans, but it is outrageous to me that not even half a decade after Sept. 11, the Administration proposed to cut state and local assistance by over 20 percent. It completely eliminated the SAFER program, which helps our struggling local fire departments fulfill ever increasing homeland security missions.

Just because we haven't needed our first responders on the scale of Sept. 11 in a while, doesn't mean that the needs are not there. We cannot afford to wait until a tragedy hits to realize that we did not do enough for them.

I am glad that this bill recognizes this reality by partly restoring the cuts that the Administration made to the grant programs such as Metropolitan Medical Response System, Firefighter grants, and Emergency Management Performance Grants. I know that my own City of New York is making good use of all these grants, including those provided through the High Threat Urban Areas program, and that they are doing so expeditiously within the accounting requirements of the Department.

I do have some concerns about the requirement that part of this funding go toward emergency medical services, because I believe our states and localities should be able to distribute all the funding to where it is needed most. But I hope to work with the Chairman and the Ranking member on these concerns in Conference.

In a related account, the bill also restores funding for the Urban Search and Rescue teams that were so crucial to not only our country's response to 9/11, but the devastation caused by last year's hurricanes as well. That is a much-needed restoration.

Beyond helping our state and municipalities, I would also like to express my support for the attention that Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member SABO have paid to balancing new demands on the Department with its ongoing missions. These critical missions, such as stopping the flow of illegal drugs and approving visas, have not gone away since 9/11 or since Fox News started sowing paranoia about our southern border. This bill properly recognizes this reality.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the bill does a good job within the amount provided for its top line. I would have wished to see more funding provided for all functions across the department, especially for assistance to our first responders. We cannot continue to move the baseline lower and lower year after year, and expect the Department, our states, and our cities to do more with less.

Until the Budget Committee passes a realistic budget resolution, however, we must play the cards that we are dealt, and this bill does a good job of that. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5441, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2007. This bill will provide valuable homeland security dollars to communities and infrastructure in our country.

I'm particularly pleased about one provision included in this bill. It will prevent U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) from seizing the property of Americans. Believe it or not, this is being done today.

For years, individuals have been allowed to purchase prescription drugs for personal use from Canada and other foreign countries. Last November, without notification, CBP began to seize medicine that Americans had bought from Canadian mail-order pharmacies. We now know that between November 2005 and February 2006 almost 13,000 packages of drugs were seized.

Preventing these life-saving drugs from getting to their intended destination puts Americans' health at risk. Many seniors on fixed incomes lost hundreds of dollars worth of drugs when they were seized. That may not seem like much to a pharmaceutical executive, but this is a lot of money to someone on a fixed income.

Section 532 of H.R. 5441 states that "None of the funds made available in this Act for United States Customs and Border Protection may be used to prevent an individual not in the business of importing a prescription drug . . . from importing a prescription drug . . ." This will put a stop to our own government confiscating the medicine on which its citizens depend. I urge passage of this bill. We should insist that this provision remain in the final bill that the House receives from the Conference Committee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5441, the Fiscal Year 2007 Homeland Security Appropriations bill.

I want to commend Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member SABO for their work on this legislation. They have done an excellent job of recognizing where this Department succeeds and where it doesn't. Integrating the 22 separate agencies into one responsive, functioning body is never easy, but the Department has had four years to do so. This legislation recognizes that Congress needs to take a greater role in overseeing this integration.

I support the approach Chairman ROGERS has taken in this legislation with requiring DHS to be more accountable to Congress on how it is allocating funds and setting policies to affectively protect our nation's citizens. For too long, money has been sitting unexpended or allocated without a clear purpose. Hurricane Katrina, taught us that we still have far to go in achieving an agile, organized and responsive Homeland Security Department.

Last year, this Committee took the first important steps towards ensuring Homeland Security Grants to states were allocated based on risk. Much more remains to be done in this area, but to the credit of the Chairman he has taken action to begin moving in this direction while authorizing legislation is still pending.

This year, the Committee has produced legislation providing \$3.2 billion for first responders—this is in addition to the \$5.1 billion still unexpended. The committee includes requirements that DHS provide reports to the Committee on how it is ensuring that the \$34.7 billion provided to first responders to develop a preparedness strategy and to measure the performance of first responders.

Additionally, \$4.2 billion is appropriated for port, cargo, and container security. This legislation sets strict requirements for operations at those ports, including doubling the amount of cargo inspected; requiring 100 percent screen-

ing of all cargo for radiation; and the establishing of security standards for all cargo containers.

We in the New Jersey and New York area have a keen understanding of how important it is to make sure that we secure such critical infrastructure. New Jersey is home to the largest and busiest seaports on the Eastern Seaboard. The Port of New York and New Jersey, positioned between New York City and Newark Liberty International Airport, is key to our nation's economy and security.

Handling more than \$100 billion in cargo a year and employing nearly 230,000 area residents, the port is the East Coast's hub in the global supply chain. This port is the most concentrated and affluent consumer market in the world, with immediate access to the most comprehensive interstate highway and rail networks in the nation.

Mr. Chairman, this is a thoughtful piece of legislation that not only provides funding for Homeland Security activities, but also holds the Department of Homeland Security accountable for how those activities are executed.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. 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. 5441

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, 2007, for the Department of Homeland Security and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENTAL
MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY AND EXECUTIVE
MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Homeland Security, as authorized by section 102 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 112), and executive management of the Department of Homeland Security, as authorized by law, \$95,884,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$40,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, \$10,000,000 shall not be available for obligation until the Secretary of Homeland Security submits a comprehensive port, container, and cargo security strategic plan to the Committee on Appropriations and Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives that requires screening all inbound cargo, doubles the percentage of inbound cargo currently inspected, sets minimum standards for securing inbound cargo, and includes the fiscal year 2007 performance requirements for port, container, and cargo security as

specified in the report accompanying this Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary is directed to submit the Secure Border Initiative multi-year strategic plan to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives no later than November 1, 2006 that includes: a comprehensive mission statement; an identification of long-term goals; an explanation of how long-term goals will be achieved; schedule and resource requirements for goal achievement; an identification of annual performance goals and how they link to long-term goals; an identification of annual performance measures used to gauge effectiveness towards goal achievement by goal; and an identification of major capital assets critical to program success.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SABO

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SABO:

In title I, in the item relating to "OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY AND EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$3,000,000)".

In title I, in the item relating to "OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$15,000,000)".

In title III, in the item relating to "OFFICE OF GRANTS AND TRAINING—FIREFIGHTER ASSISTANCE GRANTS"—

(1) after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$111,000,000)";

(2) after the second dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$41,000,000)"; and

(3) after the third dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$70,000,000)".

In title III, in the item relating to "FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY—DISASTER RELIEF", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$14,000,000)".

In title IV, in the item relating to "SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, ACQUISITION AND OPERATIONS", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$107,000,000)".

Mr. SABO (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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of myself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.

This amendment increases by \$111 million funding for the fire grant and SAFER programs, bringing appropriations to these programs to slightly above the 2006 level.

Fire and SAFER grants funding in the bill is currently \$109 million, or 17 percent below 2006. The bill funds the regular grant program at \$500 million, \$40 million below 2006, and the SAFER program is funded at \$50 million in the bill, which is \$69 million below the 2006 funding level.

My amendment would eliminate these fire grant cuts. The amendment

is offset with reductions in the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management, some from the Office of the Under Secretary for Management, and some from the funding for the Science and Technology Directorate. The funds from the Science and Technology are from \$246 million in unobligated funding that is carried into 2006, and it is likely a large portion will carry into 2007, which is why I think the 2007 funding can be reduced.

Mr. Chairman, it is a good amendment and I urge its adoption.

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

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

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Sabo-Sweeney amendment and would urge its adoption.

Let me just say this. This amendment restores funding that I think is key and essential. First responders are our frontline defense in homeland security, critically important in so many ways for rural, urban and suburban communities.

I know, for example, as a New Yorker that, on preparedness issues, both the SAFER Act and the firefighter grant dollars have been essential towards us prospectively and proactively preparing folks on the ground to really meet the needs of the community and really meet the needs of the Nation and making us prepared.

So I could not urge my colleagues more strongly to be supportive of this amendment and would ask that it be adopted.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWEENEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman makes an awfully good case. The firefighters, of course, are extremely important in our Nation's efforts to defend itself, and this funding is vital. The gentleman and all the gentlemen make a good point, and I am prepared to accept the amendment. I would hope that we could conserve some time by doing that, but I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman. I also should point out that the chairman has worked very hard with all of us, both last year and this year, to make this a reality.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I ask unanimous consent to include my statement in the RECORD in support of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. I rise in strong support of the Sabo/Hoyer/Weldon/Tubbs Jones amendment. This amendment restores \$41 million dollars to the Assistance to Firefighter Grant (AFG) Program and funds the Staffing for

Adequate Firefighters and Emergency Response (SAFER) program at \$70 million, which was zeroed out of the FY07 budget.

Adopting this amendment sends a clear message to our first responders that we appreciate the work that they do in serving emergency needs of our communities and nation.

The AFG program awards grants directly to state fire departments to enhance their ability to protect the health and safety of the public and firefighting personnel, particularly with respect to fire and fire-related hazards.

In the State of Ohio, 251 fire departments received over \$27 million during the 2005 fiscal year.

The AFG program effectively meets the needs of firefighters around the country. It is especially necessary in the wake of 9/11 and Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, as firefighters are our first line of defense when dealing with national disasters.

The SAFER program provides much-needed funding for career and volunteer fire departments across America to hire new firefighters and recruit and retain volunteer firefighters. This program is critical to the thousands of fire stations across the country that are currently operating short of staff.

The SAFER program allows fire departments throughout the country to apply for federal grants to hire and pay new firefighters for five years. In addition, grants have been awarded to state and local organizations to recruit and retain volunteer firefighters.

In March, I along with several of my Ohio Colleagues sent a letter to the Budget Committee as well as the Homeland Security Appropriations Committee to express our opposition to the President's Budget which cut the Assistance to Firefighter Grant Program by over 50% and eliminated funding for the SAFER program. In addition, I signed onto a letter with my colleague, Mr. HOYER to express my support for additional funding for these programs.

I am happy to see that the Committee has restored some of the funding to the AFG Program, but I believe more can be done.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the challenges and budgetary constraints that Congress is faced with. However, cutting programs that assist first responders at a time when homeland security is vital should be reconsidered.

I thank my colleagues Mr. OLAV SABO, Mr. HOYER and Mr. WELDON for their work on this issue. I strongly urge you to restore funding to the AFG and SAFER Grant Programs through the adoption of this amendment.

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

I ask unanimous consent to enter my statement into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member SABO for all the hard work they have put into bringing this bill to the floor.

Homeland Security is a relatively new discipline for this body and in a short amount of time my friends from Kentucky and Minnesota have proven to be experts in this field.

Likewise, I want to publicly acknowledge Congressman WELDON, Congressman HOYER and Congressman ANDREWS for the leadership they have displayed in enhancing our nation's security.

This amendment is another example of all our work to increase our emergency preparedness and response capabilities—and I ask all Members for their support.

FIREFIGHTER CHALLENGES

10,000 fire engines are at least 30 years old. 27,000 fire stations in the country have no back-up power; two-fifths of all departments lack internet access.

The majority of portable radios that firefighters use are not water resistant.

Currently two-thirds of all fire departments throughout America operate with inadequate staffing.

In communities of at least 50,000 people, 38 percent of firefighters are regularly part of a response that is not sufficient to safely respond to a structure fire because of a lack of staffing. This is unconscionable.

THE AMENDMENT

This amendment helps to tackle these problems. It provides an additional \$111 million for Firefighter grants. Of this money, \$41 million will go to the base Firefighter Grant Program and \$70 million will go to the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) program.

This additional funding is \$2 million above the FY06 level for these programs.

Fire Grants provide money directly to local departments for equipment, training, and safety programs and have been an enormous boost to first responder readiness since its inception.

Likewise, the SAFER Act provides annual grants for the purpose of hiring, recruiting and retaining career and volunteer firefighters.

To be sure, Congress has made great strides to provide assistance for our firefighters—but still more needs to be done.

There's a reason the FIRE Grant program had 20,300 applications containing close to \$3 billion in requested assistance from departments across the country this year.

And at a time when local jurisdictions are facing tough budget decisions and departments all across the country are laying off firefighters, this amendment couldn't come at a better time.

I implore support from my colleagues.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Congressmen MARTIN SABO and CURT WELDON for their leadership not only on this amendment, but also on so many issues of importance to our nation's fire service.

I also want to express my sincere appreciation to chairman ROGERS for his support of our first responders and his assistance in bringing this important amendment to the floor.

Finally, I would be remiss if I did not recognize the contributions that BILL PASCRELL has made to our nation's firefighters, notably his authoring of the original legislation to establish the assistance to the firefighters grant program.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides much-needed increases to both the fire grant and safer programs, and it moves us closer to fulfilling our obligation to ensure that our nation's firefighters have the resources necessary to guarantee their own safety—and to allow them to better serve each of our communities.

This amendment brings the funding in the bill to \$651 million—\$541 million for fire grants and \$110 million for safer.

This is \$357.6 million above the level requested by the president, and is a reflection of

congress's commitment to ensuring that our fire departments are properly staffed, trained and equipped.

However, these amounts are still well below the authorized levels, and far from meeting the needs of the fire service.

Thus, we must continue to work to increase the funding levels for each of these programs—this year and in the future.

The fire grant program was established by congress in 2000 to meet the basic equipment, training and firefighter safety requirements of America's fire service, and to bring all fire departments to a baseline of readiness to respond to all hazards.

The fire grant program has been a tremendous success, and congress has provided more than \$3.5 billion for infrared cameras, HAZMAT detection devices, modern breathing apparatuses, improved training and physical fitness programs, new turnout gear, fire trucks, and interoperable communications equipment, to name but a few items.

The simple fact is that the equipment and training provided by these grants have saved the lives of firefighters and average citizens in communities across America, and I am proud to have played a role in establishing and funding this program.

The safer program—authorized three years ago and funded for—is a vital complement to the fire grant program because insufficient staffing, defined by the national fire protection association as fewer than four firefighters per apparatus, is a very real problem for far too many of the nation's career and volunteer fire departments.

Responding with fewer than four firefighters per apparatus prevents the first responder unit from complying with OSHA's "2-in/2-Out" standard for safe fire ground operation, and adds unnecessary risk to the already dangerous job of fire suppression.

NFPA estimates that an additional 75,000 firefighters are required across the country, and the additional funding we provide today will help move us closer to that goal.

Mr. Chairman, we have an obligation to provide our firefighters with the necessary resources to perform their jobs as safely and effectively as possible.

With the adoption of this amendment, and our continued support of the fire grant and safer programs, we fulfill this obligation made by firefighters across our nation.

Again, I thank Chairman ROGERS for accepting this amendment, and for his leadership and continued support of the nation's firefighters.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KUCINICH:

On page 2, line 9, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$500,000)".

On page 34, line 6, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$500,000)".

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, my amendment funds FEMA to conduct a comprehensive study of the increase in demand for FEMA's emergency response and disaster relief services as a result of weather-related disasters as-

sociated with global warming during the next 5, 10 and 20 years. The assessment will include an analysis of the budgetary material and manpower implications of meeting such increased demand for FEMA services.

Now, we have been warned that we should expect to see more extreme weather like the severe rainstorms and snowstorms that come in El Nino season. We have been warned that we will see stronger hurricanes and hurricanes with more total rainfall. Some say we should expect more frequent hurricanes. We have been warned to expect heat waves. We have been told to expect melting glaciers, rising sea levels swallowing low-lying land in places like Bangladesh, Florida, the gulf coast and Manhattan.

We have been warned that rising temperatures will force infectious diseases to move north or upwards in elevation to expose previously unexposed and therefore defenseless populations.

We have been warned that droughts will intensify and lengthen, straining already strained water supplies and bringing crop failures, droughts and also place those areas at greaser risk for wildfires.

These warnings come from the most respected, most credible, most well-studied scientists this world has to offer. It turns out they have been right. The 10 hottest years on record have occurred in the last 15 years. We have had two consecutive record-breaking hurricane seasons, and all signs point to another one this year.

□ 1630

The polar ice cap is melting. Greenland's ice cap is melting. Permafrost in Alaska is thawing, causing homes to crumble. Residents of low-lying islands, like Tuvalu have applied for entry into other countries as climate refugees and have been denied. West Nile virus from Africa has taken a toe-hold in the U.S. The European heat wave of 2003 killed over 15,000 people. Carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere are at record levels. Scientists say these levels may not have occurred in the last 400,000 years.

These effects are directly in line with the warnings we have received from the scientific community. Even though it is difficult to attribute all of these effects, and several I haven't even mentioned, directly to climate change, some have been able to.

A recent article in Nature blames half of the risk associated with the European heat wave on human-induced warming. The World Health Organization has estimated that 150,000 deaths every year can be attributed to climate change.

Hurricane Katrina gave us another grim warning, telling us not only what we should expect but showing us what happens if we are not prepared. Katrina showed us that when disasters hit, the most vulnerable among us become even more vulnerable because they lack the resources and the access to cope. This

was made clear as image after image of those who were hit the hardest were people of modest means and people of color.

In fact, during the Chicago heat wave of 1995, African Americans were twice as likely to die as whites. The elderly, many of whom could not afford air conditioning, made up most of the victims.

Katrina showed us that disasters are expensive. We are on track to spend at least \$80 billion in supplemental spending alone. The private sector is increasingly concerned as well. Insurance companies, whose very existence relies on their predictive abilities, have seen enough to make them drop certain coverage and conduct campaigns to try to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. And reinsurance companies in particular have taken a leadership role in promoting action on climate change out of enlightened self-interest.

Hurricane Katrina showed us that an unprepared FEMA costs time, money, and lives. We cannot merely look for ways in which FEMA failed to do its job in the gulf coast. We have to allow FEMA to take into account the realities of the challenges that await them.

At the moment, we can still choose which policy options we want to exercise. We can deal with the effects of climate change in one of two ways: we can acknowledge the extraordinary challenges before us and prepare for them, voluntarily and aggressively, but steadily, predictably, and controllably; or we can continue to create policies as if there is no problem and wait for the changes to control our pace of adaptation. The choice is ours.

Let FEMA prepare for the task ahead. Vote "yes" on the Kucinich amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have grave concerns about directing FEMA to predict over the next 20 years the effects of global warming on disasters and on FEMA's disaster relief services. FEMA's efforts should be focused on improving their capabilities to coordinate the Federal response to major domestic disasters and emergencies of all types.

According to the Department of Homeland Security, neither the Department nor FEMA has the personnel nor the expertise to conduct such a study. Global warming is not a homeland security priority, and we should not expect FEMA to take on that tremendous responsibility.

So I urge Members to vote against this amendment.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, which would provide funding for FEMA to conduct a comprehensive study of its emergency response and disaster relief services as a result of weather-related disasters associated with global warming.

There is no doubt in my mind that global warming is happening and that man is contributing to it. Now, it is our responsibility to work to mitigate the impacts of potentially catastrophic climate change.

2005 is currently tied with 1998 for the warmest year on record. However, the warmth in 2005 is remarkable because, in contrast to 1998, it was not boosted by El Niño. And since 1990, we've had the 10 hottest years on record.

Hurricanes are getting stronger, heat waves are hitting harder and more often, and the polar ice cap and Greenland's ice are melting. Several weeks ago, the Northeast saw some of the worst flooding in 70 years, and the strength of Hurricane Katrina created a tragedy of Biblical proportions. These examples of what climate change can do tell us we must act now before another disaster hits.

We need to address climate change with concerted action and with bipartisan dialogue, regional cooperation and an alliance between industry and environmentalists.

The threat from global warming is very real, and we must act now to combat potentially catastrophic climate change. We cannot leave this legacy to our children and grandchildren. We simply will not have a world to live in if we continue our neglectful ways.

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

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

Mr. KUCINICH. 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 Ohio will be postponed.

Are there further amendments to this paragraph?

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to start by commending the chairman for his work on this bill, and I rise today to support the Sabo amendment. Because the debate moved along so quickly, I wasn't able to enter my statement into the RECORD, but this vital amendment would increase funding for our Nation's firefighters by over \$111 million dollars above the base bill. It is a very important amendment.

Every day in New Hampshire professional firefighters are responding to emergencies and saving lives. Two weeks ago, over 12 inches of rain in my State fell in between 36 and 48 hours, flooding much of New Hampshire. It was professional firefighters, volunteer firefighters, and other first responders that were on the front lines saving lives in New Hampshire, making sure that people were safe and were able to return to their homes.

That is why this amendment is so important to the firefighters in my State, and I thank the chairman for allowing me to strike the last word and entering this supporting statement in the RECORD.

I rise today in support of the Sabo amendment, which I am a cosponsor of. This vital amendment would increase funding for our Nation's firefighters by \$111 million over the base bill, and in particular add \$70 million for the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) Act.

Every day in New Hampshire, professional firefighters are responding to emergencies and saving lives, but they are doing so while understaffed. National standards call for 4 to 5 firefighters to respond to emergencies on a fire engine or ladder truck, yet in my district many times as few as 2 respond on a piece of fire apparatus. This amendment will help give departments the resources to hire additional firefighters through a grant program. This will help firefighters across our Nation better protect residents.

Two weekends ago over 12 inches of rain fell in 36 to 48 hours flooding much of New Hampshire. During this disaster, the Professional Firefighters of New Hampshire, the volunteer firefighters, police and National Guard troops responded immediately, effectively and courageously. In Londonderry, the firefighters rescued a young boy from the surging flood waters, saving his life, while risking their own. In Milton, Rochester, and Somersworth fire chiefs responsible for managing dams on the Salmon Falls River did so in such a way so that several thousand residents were able to safely evacuate without any loss of life. In Dover, the work of the fire department saved a bridge and retaining walls in the center of the city, that had they failed, could have severely damaged a converted mill building in which 5,000 people work. These are just several examples of the heroism that all of New Hampshire's professional firefighters and other first responders displayed during a very trying time for my state. I applaud their heroism.

In every state firefighters protect us every day. It is our responsibility to increase funding for the SAFER ACT by \$70 million to better provide the resources firefighters need to continue to do their jobs safely and effectively.

I urge the adoption of this amendment, and praise Mr. SABO and Mr. WELDON for bringing this to the floor for a vote.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF OHIO

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

In the item relating to "DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS—Office of the Secretary and Executive Management", after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$500,000) (reduced by \$500,000)".

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is based on a simple, commonsense idea: it is easier to avoid an iceberg if you see the iceberg coming.

We didn't see the UAE ports deal coming. We didn't see the Chinese effort to acquire UNOCAL coming. We didn't see the Bahamas nuclear security outsourcing contract coming. These business deals all raise serious homeland security concerns, but the bigger homeland security issue may be free trade agreements.

Trade agreements open our markets to be sure, as they should, but they also open our ports, our infrastructure, and our transportation lines. The United States Trade Representative re-

cently concluded free trade agreements with Peru and with Colombia. Peru is home to two groups listed by the State Department as foreign terrorist organizations. Colombia is home to three groups listed by the State Department as foreign terrorist organizations. Yet U.S. law does not require any systematic review of security issues raised by these or any other free trade agreements.

It doesn't have to be that way. We need not simply vote for a trade agreement and then keep our fingers crossed hoping that there are no security concerns around it or attached to it. My amendment, the Trade Related American National Security Enhancement and Accountability Amendment, offers a responsible alternative. It simply reduces the Department of Homeland Security Management and Operations funding by \$500,000 then increases it by the same amount.

The intent is to earmark these funds for the Department of Homeland Security to, one, coordinate with the Justice Department and the State Department on a security review of the Peru free trade agreement and the Colombia free trade agreement; second, to analyze and report to Congress on any security issues raised by these agreements.

This amendment would in no way delay the implementation of either free trade agreement, but it would give Congress a look at the security issues raised by these agreements.

If you believe, as I do, that avoiding the iceberg is easier if you see it coming, please join me in supporting this commonsense reform.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I understand the gentleman's concern, but would point out that such determinations are the work of the U.S. Trade Representative. This amendment would have more value if considered in the context of a bill that authorizes or funds the U.S. Trade Representative or the Department of State. As these activities are outside the jurisdiction of the Department of Homeland Security, that would require a new authorization.

Finally, the Department is still focusing on its primary responsibilities of protecting the homeland and has little expertise in making determinations about liability or trade activities.

For those reasons, I urge Members to vote against the amendment.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in support of the Brown amendment.

The Brown amendment does something that I think is really essential in that it links homeland security to free trade agreements. We cannot ignore the broad effects of our trade agreements on our national security, and that is what Mr. BROWN is seeking to demonstrate here.

It seems we have a lack of awareness in this Chamber about not only the effects of climate change on our homeland security but also the powerful economic effects of these trade agreements on our homeland security. I mean, frankly, when it comes to climate change, an administration study on the social life of the ostrich isn't going to suffice.

We have to take a direction that shows we know there is a problem because of the effects. We are seeing the effects of these trade agreements on our economy. We already know where these trade agreements have taken our economy. We have over an \$800 billion trade deficit. If that doesn't raise a question of homeland security, what does?

Support the Brown amendment.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. 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 Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KING of Iowa:

Page 2, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$40,000,000)".

Page 3, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced \$60,000,000)".

Page 13, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$100,000,000)".

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, my amendment moves \$40 million from the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management and \$60 million from the Office of the Under Secretary of Management to construction under Customs and Border Patrol towards building a wall, a fence on our southern border. It sets up \$100 million, \$40 million from the one category and \$60 million from the other category.

This is a simple concept, Mr. Chairman. I have this demonstration here of just simply a precast concrete foundation that would be set in with a trencher and slip-form machine that would leave a slot in here. One could then take tongue-and-groove panels that would be 13½ feet long by 6 inches thick and drop them in here. It is a very fast and efficient construction method and a relatively cheap construction method. It is installable, it is removable, and it is impregnable, at least with the things we are seeing on the border today.

I have taken a number of trips down to the border, have spent a number of nights on the border, and have observed what is going on down there; and I am absolutely convinced that we will never get operational control of our border unless we are able to put in a human barrier that will be effective.

There are \$60 billion worth of illegal drugs that are coming across our southern border; and no matter what we do to put in a vehicle barrier or put another 6,000 Border Patrol troops down there, they will still infiltrate through. We can make their time far more effective by having a sealed human barrier.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate my colleague from Iowa (Mr. KING) for offering this amendment, and I certainly appreciate his leadership and dedication to this issue.

I do want to commend Chairman ROGERS on his dedicated leadership to putting together a strong homeland security bill which includes \$30 million to complete the San Diego border infrastructure system, including a fence there, as well as \$8 million with the cost associated with the Arizona Border Control Initiative. Those are good things.

What our amendment does is supplement that and adds \$100 million by taking out money for bureaucrats sitting here in Washington that are not making this country safer by sitting in an office. We want to put fences out in the places that will be needed and necessary.

This \$100 million will stop this mass flow of illegal immigrants across our southern border. The 12 million illegals, 10 to 20 million, in this country, in fact, can attest to the ease by which you can cross over the border.

I commend my colleague, Mr. KING, for his dedicated leadership to this very important issue in stifling the flow of illegal immigrants across our southern border, and I urge my colleagues to support this initiative.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This bill provides significant resources for border security programs and is currently balanced among the many competing homeland security priorities. This amendment significantly upsets that balance and undermines the Department's ability to effectively integrate its business systems.

□ 1645

I have grave concerns about the off-sets contained in this amendment, off-sets that decimate DHS's management. Taking \$40 million, almost half of the Secretary's budget, would effectively shut down all planning and management from DHS leadership.

We have already reallocated \$50 million from the Office of Under Secretary to operational agencies in the bill itself. A \$61 million reduction to this office would stop all work on the new personnel and payroll systems that are under development.

The subcommittee carefully reviewed the President's request and made sig-

nificant modifications in order to ensure all mission areas had sufficient resources.

What this amendment does is unravel over 5 months of committee oversight. We have held 11 hearings this year, digging deep into the resource requirements of the Department and examining the most ominous threats facing the Nation. Almost without exception, all of the programs funded in this bill are critical. But what we can't afford to do is fund one program at the expense of all others.

This bill provides significant border security resources, administers tough oversight, drives DHS to properly plan its work and improve our border security and immigration enforcement programs. I would hope that we would turn down this amendment.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the word.

I just wanted to rise and agree with the chairman. This is an amendment that should not be adopted. We have already spent additional significant resources on the border. We are also starting the SDI program, the Secure Borders Initiative. I happen to think it is not well planned, but my assumption is that programs like this would be part of whatever this grand scheme is that is being developed.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I would make a parliamentary inquiry of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. SABO. We made some modest cuts in the Office of Under Secretary in our first amendment as related to fire grants which was adopted which I thought was okay to do; but I notice a whole host of amendments are funded by additional cuts to that same office.

I am curious if we roll votes and eventually there are more cuts than money exists, what happens? I understand this amendment takes an additional \$60 billion out of the office. There are others coming with several million. There is a whole array of amendments, all of which take money from this particular office.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would inform the gentleman that amendments already pending as unfinished business would be disposed of in due course.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The amendment was rejected.

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 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$3,000,000)".

Page 28, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert the following "(increased by \$3,000,000)".

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to listen because this is the Neighborhood

Watch of homeland security, and every single Member has the Citizen Corps as established by the homeland security legislation a few years ago. The authorizing committee supports the Citizen Corps that is basically premised on securing the homeland in the neighborhoods.

I simply want to come as close to the President's request as possible. The request the President made was \$35 million. We have in this bill 0 amount for the Citizen Corps. We simply take a very, very small amount, Mr. Chairman, \$3 million, to provide some comfort and relief to all of the community-based organizations that engage as part of the Citizen Corps for safety in the neighborhoods. It was a wonderful concept, and the concept was devised so everyone could be a stakeholder in the Nation's security. One of the few things that did work in the course of the 2005 hurricanes was the Citizen Corps. Members of the Citizen Corps helped train the tens of thousands of volunteers who showed up and asked for something to do. They are still working.

I can recall as thousands upon thousands of evacuees began to enter into the city of Houston and the county of Harris, Mayor Bill White and Judge Robert Eckels, county government and city government relied upon the Citizen Corps established so all could be stakeholders.

I am very proud that the National Volunteer Fire Council is supporting this legislation and asking colleagues to support it. We realize we have some very difficult times and some very difficult decisions to make, but I can assure you that the Citizen Corps implements five programs around the United States: community emergency response team; the medical reserve corps; the Neighborhood Watch program; the Volunteers in the Police Service and the Fire Corps.

I can remember after 9/11 when we began to tell Americans watch for suspicious packages, watch for suspicious persons, be part of the security of the Nation. That is the concept of the Citizen Corps. This does not undermine the underpinnings of this bill. In fact, it enhances it. It reaffirms volunteerism and makes Americans a partner in their own homeland security.

I know we cannot provide the \$35 million that the President has asked for. I wish we could. This just gives an extra \$3 million. That may fund one or two more National Volunteer Fire Councils, one or two more Citizen Corps. I can assure you when your communities hear about Citizen Corps, they will want to have it.

Just a few weeks ago in our community, the Citizen Corps planned a city-wide preparedness effort. People from all walks of life, all neighborhoods, all economic levels worked together to provide security for their communities.

We can do that all over the Nation. Members, if they just ask the question

to their county government or city government, they will find out that Citizen Corps is alive and well. This money is their lifeline. This money keeps them going. This money provides them educational outreach. It provides the money for the Neighborhood Watch program, the Volunteers to the Police Service and the Fire Corps. I ask my colleagues to support this.

I appreciate the work of the ranking member and the chairman. I would ask my colleagues to not forget the National Volunteer Fire Council and all of those volunteers that come under the Citizen Corps. Let us help them get to the next step and provide security for the United States. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

This amendment seeks to increase funding for the Homeland Security Citizens Corps by \$3 million from \$0 million to \$3 million. The program has been widely regarded as effective and President Bush requested that it be funded in the amount of \$35 million. For more information on the program, visit www.citizenscorps.gov.

One of the few things that did work in the course of the 2005 hurricanes was the Citizen Corps. Members of the Citizen Corps helped organize and train the tens of thousands of volunteers who showed up and asked for something to do.

The Harris County, Texas Citizen Corps Council implements five programs: the Community Emergency Response Team, the Medical Reserve Corps, the Neighborhood Watch Program, the Volunteers in Police Service, and the Fire Corps.

The volunteers who participate in these programs help support our emergency responders year round and they provide a trained surge capacity in times of crisis.

The Harris County Citizen Corps Council also conducts outreach to educate the general public about the hazards we face and the county's emergency operations plan, including evacuations and considerations for people with disabilities, language and cultural barriers, and economic challenges.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to increase the funding, as President Bush has requested, for the Citizen Corps in order to train our citizens to become better prepared for whatever the future holds.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, Citizen Corps was originally established to create the Citizens Preparedness Guidebook to give Americans guidance on how to prepare in their homes, neighborhoods, workplaces, and public spaces. That work has been done.

Citizen Corps Councils are redundant. Work is being performed by State and local homeland security emergency preparedness offices. State offices are now robust enough after 9/11 to assess threats, help with community planning, evacuation and the like. These are government functions, not volunteer functions.

Citizen Corps functions are funded through other sources. Money comes to them from the Department of Justice through its Neighborhood Watch pro-

grams, its volunteers and police service programs, and the Department of Health and Human Services through its medical reserve program.

The subcommittee's 302(b) allocation could not accommodate all of the President's requests. The allocation of \$32 billion does not fully adjust for the proposed increase in aviation passenger fees generating \$1.3 billion in new revenue. Therefore, the committee has had to make some very tough choices, and this is one of them.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose the gentlewoman's amendment.

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

I support the Citizen Corps and yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am very cognizant of the very difficult choices of this subcommittee. We had difficult choices in the authorizing committee.

But I would say to the distinguished gentleman, with all due respect, the President did not think that this allocation of \$35 million which we were not able to give was redundant.

Also the Homeland Security Department likewise continues to promote the Citizen Corps, particularly through the National Fire Council.

The whole fabric and framework of America changed after Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita. We saw the value of the Citizens Corps in the midst of the hurricane. I cannot tell you the vastness of the support that came to a city and a county like Houston and Harris County when thousands upon thousands of evacuees, and I might imagine that happened to New York and Dallas and Los Angeles, it was the Citizen Corps that did the heavy lifting.

I would ask my colleagues with respect to the challenges of this particular appropriations to consider this amendment and consider those volunteers on the ground. Do not let the National Council of Fire Volunteers down. This is their source of funding. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANGEVIN:

Page 2, line 9, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$3,000,000)".

Page 3, line 15, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$33,000,000)".

Page 42, line 16, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$36,000,000)".

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to ask all Members to fully fund the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office within the Department of Homeland Security.

My amendment will add \$36 million to the DNDO for a total of \$536 million, the exact amount requested by the President. My amendment would increase the funding to the amount authorized also by the Safe Ports Act which passed this House just a few weeks ago by the overwhelming margin of 421-2.

The DNDO was created within the Department of Homeland Security to develop, acquire and deploy the global nuclear detection architecture to prevent nuclear material from being smuggled into our country. The office coordinates with a variety of public and private sector organizations, including the Departments of Defense, Energy and State, the FBI, State, local and tribal governments. The office is jointly staffed by experts from many of these agencies.

As the ranking member of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on the Prevention of Nuclear and Biological Attack, I have to say, Mr. Chairman, I am kept awake at night by the fear that a terrorist could smuggle nuclear material across our borders to detonate a bomb in one of our cities.

These radiation detectors are our last best chance to prevent a catastrophic nuclear or radiological attack, and our intelligence analysts tell us the threat is very real.

The DNDO is already in the process of deploying radiation detectors at our border crossings, ports and other points of entry. They have a goal of deploying more than 3,000 of these detectors by 2009.

But I believe the risk is too great to wait until 2009. Worse yet, a recent GAO report stated that the DNDO could not even meet the 2009 goal without additional funding. An additional \$36 million will help speed the deployment and the development of radiation portal monitors, handheld and mobile radiation detectors, and the next generation advanced spectroscopic portals, which all provide a varying range of detection capability.

□ 1700

Mr. Chairman, I have great faith in the DNDO, but they need sufficient resources to complete their vital mission. Every year we spend more than \$9 billion in missile defense. Surely, we can spend an additional \$36 million to prevent nuclear smuggling, which intelligence analysts insist is a far greater threat.

Earlier this afternoon, I had the opportunity to question Vayl Oxford, President Bush's appointee to direct the DNDO, at our subcommittee hearing. He indicated that without full funding, DNDO would have to scale back valuable short- and long-term research and development projects that will lead to the next generation detec-

tion equipment, which will be faster and more accurate.

My amendment is offset by the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management by \$3 million and the Office of Undersecretary for Management by \$33 million.

Mr. Chairman, the threat of nuclear smuggling is too important to ignore. I ask my colleagues to join me in fully funding the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office to develop and deploy detectors before we miss our opportunity to prevent nuclear material from being smuggled into our country, and ultimately, it will allow us to save lives.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. SABO, here we go again, another amendment to take money from the Office of Secretary and Executive Management and the Office of the Under Secretary for Management. As Mr. SABO has pointed out earlier, if we keep cutting this office, there will not be any office.

The gentleman's amendment would want to increase funding for DNDO by \$36 million. Our bill already provides, Mr. Chairman, a 59 percent increase for this office above the current level. The committee reduced funding for DNDO below the budget request because we had concerns with two specific programs, Surge, s-u-r-g-e and transformational research. The Surge program is an effort to purchase and restore equipment for use in times of need, a good idea for a more mature program.

But at this point, resources are needed for detectors on the front lines. Transformational Research, though trimmed, is still an increase of 50 percent over last year. I think we are doing the best we can do by this office at this time.

I oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. 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 Rhode Island will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STUPAK

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STUPAK:

Page 2, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

Page 14, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, our Nation's families face a growing threat from the proliferation of child exploitation and pornography on the Internet. One in five children report having

been sexually solicited on the Internet; 3.5 million pornographic images of children of American children are now estimated to be in circulation on the Internet. This is a rapidly growing problem and one which has already grown far beyond what most Americans are aware of.

Last year alone, child pornography brought traffickers \$20 billion in profits as compared to only \$3 billion for legitimate Internet music sales. The Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations on which I sit as the ranking member recently held hearings to highlight this growing threat.

During the course of these hearings, members of the subcommittee had a chance to hear about the excellent work the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Cyber Crime Center is doing to combat child exploitation. Since the center was founded in 2003, less than 3 years ago, its work has resulted in arrests of over 7,500 child predators.

The Cyber Crimes Center was funded at only \$6 million last year, but has already been recognized as being at the forefront in fighting, in the fight against child exploitation and Internet crime. My amendment would add \$5 billion to the Immigration and Customs Enforcement salaries and expenses which would be used by the Cyber Crimes Center to expand their operations.

The \$5 million would be offset by reduction in the Office of the Secretary, which is funded over \$95 million in the base bill. I believe that this \$5 million amendment is the least we can do in the fight against a \$20 billion criminal industry that preys on our children.

This is a chance to reward and expand the excellent law enforcement work being done at ICE and to take steps to combat the increasing threat to our children and families. If you look at the committee report, it indicates, and I quote from the committee report in support of this legislation here today, this year, the committee notes gaps in funding for drug interdiction, human smuggling, cyber crimes, child pornography, Secret Service investigations and funding for our first responders.

The committee recommendation includes \$5 million, the same as fiscal year 2006, for memory and technology support for the Cyber Crimes Center. We are doing what the committee is asking us to do.

Who are the victims of child pornography? Eighty percent of these predators have material depicting children under the age of 12; 40 percent under the age of 6; and 20 percent are victims under the age of 3. Victims are 28 times more likely to become prostitutes; 86 percent of the victims develop serious long-term mental illness.

Mr. Chairman, we are working on this amendment here tonight, and we are taking it from the Secretary's budget, and I am sure that the chairman will once again say we are going

to take this Secretary away and have nothing left.

Well, there is \$95 million. We want \$5 million, because this is a growing problem. It has been by leaps and bounds. In fact, we are doing more hearings as soon as we get back first part of June. We have had hearings in which 15,000 names, addresses, credit cards, Internet provider addresses were turned over to the Department of Justice, and nothing is done because the resources are not there to follow through.

So reality is that Internet child pornography and exploitation is growing more rampant, more horrific, and more sophisticated. The Cyber Crimes Unit employees know all too well how daunting their job is. We owe it to these dedicated men and women to give them all the resources we can. This additional \$5 million will make a meaningful difference.

The appropriations bill, while an increase over the President's request, essentially has flat funded this program. I thank the committee for their continued commitment, and I know we have to make some tough decisions, but this is one we should do for America's children and to stop this horrific crime of child exploitation and pornography over the Internet.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Here we go again, cutting the Secretary and the Secretary for Management's office. If we keep doing this, we are not going to have an office. So I have grave concerns. The Office of the Secretary has already been reduced from 2006 by \$30 million and the President's budget request by \$2 million because of vacancies within the office. Further reductions would cut into critical funding to hire for the management and oversight of the Secure Border Initiative and to ensure that the Committee on Foreign Investment in the U.S., known as CFIUS, is adequately staffed to fully monitor possible foreign investment in critical infrastructure.

Border security and CFIUS issues span multiple agencies within the Department. Both of these issues have been in the news, of course, repeatedly, and the Department has been severely criticized for its lack of expertise and breadth of knowledge in these areas. If there is no one to work on the issues within the Office of the Secretary, I can assure you they will not be adequately addressed. Each DHS agency will work separately and independently from each other, keeping the stovepipes in place and ensuring that these criticisms continue.

I completely agree with the gentleman that the work being carried out by ICE's child exploitation unit, known as C3, is critical. This amendment would effectively double the operating budget of the C3. We have already increased funding for the center in our base bill. The bill we have presented to this body balances and reflects 5

months of careful oversight and review. The resources provided to C3, \$5 million, are sufficient for the pending year. Additional funding is not necessary and could not be used.

So while I applaud the gentleman's priorities here, I find the increase not practical nor needed and ask our colleagues to reject this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

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

Mr. STUPAK. 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 Michigan will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR
MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Management, as authorized by sections 701 through 705 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341-345), \$159,489,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$3,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided, \$8,206,000 shall remain available until expended solely for the alteration and improvement of facilities, tenant improvements, and relocation costs to consolidate Department headquarters operations.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARKEY:

Page 3, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$35,000,000)".

Page 28, line 9, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$35,000,000)".

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's point of order is reserved.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, we have something which is called the Metropolitan Medical Response System. This is the system that has been set up in 125 major communities across the United States, every major metropolitan area, in order to coordinate the response of the police, the fire and the emergency medical personnel in the event that there is a terrorist attack; a hurricane; tornado; an earthquake; or, as we have learned over the last 6 or 8 months, an avian flu disaster which hits a community. Last year, there was \$30 million which was appropriated. To the credit of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from Minnesota, after the White House recommended zero for this program, the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from Minnesota have restored the \$30 million. But in the Homeland Security Committee, on which I serve, by a unanimous vote just a month ago, our com-

mittee voted to double the number to \$60 million.

Now, why did we do that? Well, in addition to that number's being endorsed by the International Association of Fire Chiefs, all of these medical personnel across the country who say that the funding is woefully inadequate, you have just about every local police and fire department who are saying that they are going to be overwhelmed if one of these disasters hits their community.

So just to recap the last 12 months, since the \$30 million was established as the number, we have already had Hurricane Katrina, which has exposed the inadequacies of the coordination of local police and fire and medical personnel. We have had the avian flu, which has arisen as a threat to the public health and safety of every community in our country. And there is no community at this point which is bragging that they are prepared to deal with this catastrophe if it hits their hometown.

□ 1715

So what we have done is identify a couple of programs, including the MAXHR program, which every union in America is opposed to because it is just going to redesign the whole way in which people are hired, and instead substituted money which will actually go to these local police and fire and medical personnel so that we can have the planning which is put in place.

We all know that when a catastrophe occurs in a community, nobody calls the Department of Homeland Security. They call the local police department, they call the local fire department, they call the local hospital. They are crying out to us saying they don't have the resources. That is why the Homeland Security Committee upped the number from \$30 million to \$60 million just last month.

Every one of these people, we saw it New York City, we saw it down here, these people are heroes. But heroes need help. They need the resources. They need the planning to be put in place. That is why the fire chiefs, that is why these local unions are all crying out, please, give us the help. We will take the risk. We will go into the flaming buildings. We will try to stop the flood. We will put our own health on the line in the event of an avian flu hitting a community. But give us the planning, give us the capacity now to put in place the response mechanism.

That is what this amendment does. And all it does is respond to what all these experts have told us the number has to be. \$30 million is clearly inadequate, given what we have learned since last year with avian flu and what happened in New Orleans and across the whole gulf coast.

I urge an "aye" vote in order to ensure that this funding is made available to these local heroes.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read. The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because the amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill by \$3.5 million.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I am not asking for this amendment to be considered en bloc. I would ask for the gentleman from Kentucky to explain further his point of order so that it can be better understood by the Chair and by the proponent of the amendment.

I would yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may not yield, but the Chair will hear each Member in turn.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ruling from the Chair. The amendment amends two portions of the bill, one taking from one section and giving back to another.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman have further comment on the point of order?

Mr. MARKEY. No, I await the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. To be considered en bloc pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI, an amendment must not propose to increase the levels of budget authority or outlays in the bill. Because the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts proposes a net increase in the level of outlays in the bill, as argued by the chairman of the relevant Subcommittee on Appropriations, it may not avail itself of clause 2(f) to address portions of the bill not yet read. The point of order is upheld.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. Chairman, could you tell me where in the amendment there is a proposed change in the budget authority?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order was based on an increase in outlays, not budget authority.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, if I may continue to make a parliamentary inquiry, we have a CBO score that says that there is actually a reduction in outlays of \$20 million. I am asking my staff to present to the Chair, before he concludes his ruling, the actual documentation from CBO that reflects that finding, which I think would as a result mean that the amendment was in compliance.

Mr. Chairman, I think we are each aware at this point there is a certain amount of terminological inexactitude in the numbers that both sides are using right now; and, as a result, I defer to the ruling of the Chair. But I will announce that I will try to come back with a redrafted proposal in this area.

The CHAIRMAN. The ruling of the Chair stands.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LYNCH:

Page 3, line 15, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$50,000,000)".

Page 28, line 23, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

Page 29, line 15, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

Page 30, line 7, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, together with Mr. HOLT of New Jersey and Mr. CASTLE of Delaware, this amendment seeks to increase the amount appropriated by H.R. 5441 for rail and transportation security grants from \$150 million to \$200 million.

The \$50 million added to the rail security grants is to be offset by a novel idea today, which is to decrease by \$50 million the amount appropriated for the Office of the Under Secretary for Management.

Mr. Chairman, we are grossly underfunding rail security in this country at a time when it should be a major priority. There is an old saying that states that Congress is always fighting the last war. If you look at the area of transportation security, we have spent \$22 billion on aviation security, 97 percent of the transportation money, and only 3 percent of transportation security money on rail. So 97 percent, \$22 billion, on aviation, and about half a billion dollars on rail security. This flies in the face of experience.

As you look around the world today, the pattern of terrorist activity has been markedly against rail systems. If you go back to 1995, the Tokyo rail system was attacked by sarin gas. The Algerian rebels attacked the Paris subways. Going further, the Chechnyan rebels attacking the Moscow subways, the attacks in Madrid against their commuter rail system, many, many attacks on bus systems in Israel and, most recently, the London attacks against their subway system.

So there is a definite repeated pattern of conduct of these terrorists to attack rail systems. We need to be aware that they are looking at attacking our rail system. You would think that we would take appropriate steps to address that, given the fact that five times as many people travel by rail as travel by air.

Rather than addressing that woeful state of rail transit security funding, the current administration has actually sought to further shortchange these critical transportation systems. Most recently, the President's FY 2007 budget request allocated only \$37 million to the Transportation Security Administration for non-aviation transportation security. That is less than 1 percent of TSA's budget, 1 percent for rail. Moreover, the President again proposed the outright elimination of rail and transit security grants.

Accordingly, I would like to first commend Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member SABO for their great efforts to preserve separate funding for rail security. However, I am greatly concerned that rail and transit security

grant funding has remained at \$150 million under the past two DHS appropriations bills. In addition, I am equally concerned that the bill under consideration today proposes to appropriate the same \$150 million for FY 2007.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support our amendment.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to join my colleague from Massachusetts as well as my colleague from Delaware, who is the cochair of the House Passenger Rail Caucus, in shifting this funding into the rail, freight and transit security grant program.

□ 1730

I understand what the appropriators have gone through. Maybe everyone in this House could rewrite the bill in some way. But it clearly merits attention when we are spending 70 times as much for air security as for rail security.

As the 9/11 Commission said, it appears that we are fighting the last war. Of course, we watched in horror as airplanes were used as explosive missiles. But we have thousands of people traveling by rail. We have important freight routes. We have thousands of miles of track, just in New Jersey, 800 trains, 1,000 miles of track, 161 rail stations patrolled by a couple hundred uniformed officers.

The money in this program that we propose to increase can be used for explosive-agent sensors, for security cameras, for interoperable communications. That was driven home to us just today when travelers in the northeast corridor coming out of New York traveling through New Jersey were shut down for hours.

And as they were shut down because of a power failure, they discovered they had difficulty communicating with each other. The various trains had trouble communicating with each other. We clearly need to address the security in all of these areas.

The GAO reported in 2002 that in just eight transit agencies, there was a need for security improvements that totaled well over \$700 million, far more than we have spent in the intervening years.

Mr. Chairman, you have heard from my friend from Massachusetts that this is not a maybe; there is unfortunately a long tally of security breaches, of terrorist attacks around the world. And this funding will go a long way toward preparing the rail systems throughout the United States against such terrorist attacks.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise also in support of the Holt-Castle-Lynch amendment to increase funding for crucial intercity passenger rail transit and freight security grants. By transit, we are talking about subways and local trains.

Earlier this morning, as the gentleman from New Jersey just stated,

the northeast corridor came to a halt, and close to 70,000 commuters were effectively stranded between Boston and Washington, D.C., including several trains trapped in tunnels in New York City and Baltimore.

I was not on any of those trains, but that one stuck in Baltimore is the one that I could have been on very easily. While this frightening incident turned out to be the result of a power outage, it underscores the sheer panic and disruption that a terrorist attack on rail systems could cause in this and many other parts of the country.

In the wake of attacks on subway trains in London and on passenger rail lines in Madrid, it is clear that terrorist organizations are intent on disrupting surface transportation systems and mass transit around the world.

While the legislation before us provides essential funding for much needed aviation and port security programs, we still have not had success in developing a comparable strategy for securing our Nation's rail and transit systems.

Over the last several years, funding for rail and transit security grants has been stagnant at \$150 million, and annual rail security spending for the Transportation Security Administration has been minimal when compared to the \$20 billion that our government has spend on aviation security since 2001.

In fact, the 9/11 Commission characterized the Federal focus on aviation security following the 2001 terrorist attacks as "fighting the last war" and noted that opportunities to do harm are as great or greater in maritime or surface transportation.

Clearly, Congress must change course and get a few steps ahead rather than constantly reacting to incidents and attacks once they have already occurred. Over 9.7 billion transit trips are taken annually on all modes of transit service. And the American Public Transportation Association recently estimated that \$560 million is necessary to begin securing rail and transit systems this year alone.

While our amendment is not a complete solution to this funding shortfall, it represents a responsible step forward to begin funding critical priorities. The Holt-Castle-Lynch amendment is fully offset. I realize it is offset from the same Office of the Under Secretary of Management that concerns Mr. ROGERS and Mr. SABO, but I am sure there are other oppositions because they were trying to protect the money for us in this particular amendment, and they will speak to that, hopefully, shortly to come later.

It would boost funding to add more police officers, K-9 teams, security cameras, fences and chemical detection systems at train stations and on subways and commuter systems across the country. We are very lucky that an attack has not taken place in the United States. And we now have a great opportunity to be proactive and begin ade-

quately funding rail and transit security in this country.

This amendment sets forth the course for achieving this goal, and I ask my colleagues to support this critical provision to protect American travelers.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about the fact that we have been flat-funding rail security over the last several years. Millions of tons of hazardous materials are shipped daily across America's rail lines. And any one of these shipments could become potentially a weapon of mass destruction.

Also, millions and millions of passengers travel our passenger rails every day and could be placed at risk by a terrorist attack. Let's just look at the record. In the year 2001, a 60-car freight train carrying hazardous materials derailed in a tunnel in Baltimore and literally shut down the city.

In March 2004, a series of coordinated attacks in Madrid, Spain, killed 192 people. In July of 2005, three bombs exploded in the British or the London Underground; 56 people were killed and 700 were injured. We see from these terrorist attacks abroad that there is a pattern of activity and an ability to target these rail systems successfully.

And yet here in the United States, we have flat-funded security for our passenger rail and for our freight rail. My family rides the rails virtually every day. I have got relatives in Connecticut who commute into New York City. My wife goes to Boston twice a week. When my daughter and my niece come up from New York, they ride the rails.

So this may not appear to be a hazard to some of our colleagues who live in parts of the country that do not rely as heavily as we do on rail transportation, but what we have discovered from talking to the Amtrak police over the last several months is that there are three Amtrak policemen covering the route, stationed in New Haven and covering the route roughly from the New York border to Providence. Another three out of Baltimore covering the routes north and south from New York and to Washington, D.C.

This does not seem to be an adequate investment of personnel to cover these passenger trains that go along these tracks on a daily basis. Furthermore, the Amtrak police have a tremendous turnover of personnel. They have lost 100 percent of their personnel over the last 10 years due to the lack of a contract, a lack of adequate funding and a lack of benefits.

And new personnel that come in and train frequently leave after a year or so to get better paying jobs in municipal police forces around the northeastern United States. This is a serious problem that needs to be addressed.

My colleagues have referred to our fighting the last war. And we have done a magnificent job in providing resources for aviation. We have done very

well. But we seem to have forgotten that more people travel on our passenger rails on a daily basis than fly.

And less people and less dollars are applied to this problem. The American Public Transportation Association has written to us on the subject and has pointed out that rail security is seriously underfunded. So I am glad to join my colleagues in supporting this amendment to H.R. 5441.

I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for all of his hard work and especially the staff. But I think this is an area where we need to add some more dollars.

Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of the amendment proposed by my good friends in the northeast corridor, Congressman CASTLE and Congressman HOLT.

This amendment would provide a much needed increase of \$50 million for public transportation security. Mr. Chairman, just today hundreds of my constituents were trapped on a completely shut down northeast corridor of the Amtrak system. It turned out, as we know now, to be a power outage. It could have just as well have been an attack on the infrastructure.

Attacks in London, Madrid and Russia emphasize the great and immediate need to strengthen security on public transit systems. I advise everyone to heed this warning. An APTA survey found transit agencies around the country have identified more than \$6 billion in transit security funding needs.

The Federal Government must be a full partner in the effort to ensure the security of the Nation's transit users. Terrorists do not only target the sky, Mr. Chairman. This amendment recognizes the need for greater Federal resources for rail and public transportation security.

Americans use public transportation vehicles over 32 million times each weekday. This is more than 16 times the number of daily travels on the Nation's airlines. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the bill is currently balanced among the many competing homeland security priorities. This amendment significantly upsets that balance and undermines the Department's ability to effectively integrate its business systems.

The subcommittee carefully reviewed the President's request. We made significant modifications in order to ensure all mission areas had sufficient resources, including restoration of funds for all first responder grants by adding \$500 million; restoration of funds for critical law enforcement functions, such as the CPB air and marine operations, and the Secret Service. We increased funding for critical explosive

detection systems, significant funding and oversight for all aspects of border security and immigration reform.

What this amendment would do, Mr. Chairman, is unravel over 5 months of committee oversight, 11 hearings, digging deep into the resource requirements of the Department, facing the most ominous threats facing our Nation. The fact is, almost without exception, all of the programs funded in this bill are critical.

But what we cannot afford to do is fund one program at the expense of all of the others. I have grave concerns about a \$50 million reduction in the Office of the Under Secretary For Management. We have talked about this all day today.

This office is already \$8 million below funding for the current year. Assuming that the under secretary of management would not lay off its current personnel, key projects would have to be terminated in order to absorb the \$50 million reduction in this office.

The under secretary for management is responsible for consolidating the 22 agencies that formed DHS in 2003, 180,000 employees, 18 different personnel and payroll systems, and numerous financial management systems. We have made some progress. More is needed.

But a \$50 million reduction in this office would ensure that the under secretary would have to stop all work on the new personnel and payroll systems that are under development now.

Because of the size of this offset, the under secretary would be prevented from the hiring of 25 new procurement employees that we provided for him. The Department has been unable to receive a clean financial audit in the first 2 years of its existence and has repeatedly been in the news for poor procurement decisions and inadequate contract management.

The 25 new procurement employees were requested to help the Department receive a clean financial audit, get a better handle on the Department's contracts.

As far as the proposed increase for rail and transit security, the responsibility of securing our Nation's rail and mass transit systems is shared between the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of transportation, and in partnership with the public and private entities that own and operate the Nation's transit and rail systems.

□ 1745

Since DHS was created, \$436 million has been appropriated for rail security. With \$150 million in this bill, we will have provided a total of \$603 million for rail security in the last 3 years.

The Department of Transportation, Mr. Chairman, has also provided funding for rail and transit security, averaging about \$40 to \$50 million per year. That funding, coupled with the funding that we provide, equals the total amount contained in the amendment of

the gentleman. We are giving you the money from two different places. So I think we have satisfied the gentleman's financial request, and I would hope that we would oppose and vote against this amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

It's been almost five years since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, and more than two years since the terrorist train bombing in Madrid, Spain, which killed 191 people and wounded more than 1,800 others, making it the deadliest terrorist attack against European civilians since 1988. We are now fast approaching the first anniversary of the London terrorist attacks.

The Madrid and London bombings were just the latest in a series of terrorist attacks on railroads worldwide. Between 1998 and 2003, there were 181 attacks on trains and rail-related targets such as depots, ticket stations, and rail bridges, resulting in an estimated 431 deaths and several thousand injuries.

Yet the Federal Government has done little to enhance rail and transit security in the United States. This year, the United States will spend \$4.7 billion on aviation security, while spending only \$150 million on rail and transit security, even though five times as many people take trains as planes every day.

Amtrak alone has requested over \$100 million in security upgrades and nearly \$600 million for fire and life-safety improvements to tunnels on the Northeast Corridor in New York, Maryland, and Washington, DC. The American Public Transit Association, which represents transit agencies and commuter railroads, has well-documented transit security needs that exceed \$6 billion (including more than \$5.2 billion of capital investment security needs).

This bill—for the third year in a row—provides a meager \$150 million to be split up among our Nation's passenger railroad, transit agencies, seven Class I railroads, and more than 500 short line and regional railroads.

The Lynch amendment will provide an additional \$50 million for rail and transit security. While I believe that even more funding should be provided for security improvements, such as interoperable communication systems, cameras, improved lighting, fencing and secured gates, chemical/biological/radiological detection sensors, bomb sniffing dogs, and many other needed rail security improvements, it is more than we have done in the past, and it is at least on par for what we have provided for port security.

We have got to act now to protect the safety and security of our Nation's railroads and transit systems. We owe it to the service providers, passengers, workers, and communities. We must pass this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts will be postponed.

Are there further amendments to this paragraph?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEFAZIO:

Page 3, line 15, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$15,000,000)".

Page 5, line 19, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$15,000,000)".

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, we have already had some discussion about the Secretary's budget and the concerns of the Chair and certainly there needs to be some amount of support for that, but this goes to a critical function, a function of the Department which actually could produce more dollars and make America more secure.

The Department of Homeland Security's Office of Inspector General has done tremendous work. They have saved the taxpayers millions of dollars. They have uncovered fraud and abuse. Right from the beginning the \$500,000 that was spent on art, silk, plants and other frou frou things at the new headquarters, that was uncovered by the OIG.

The OIG was then detailed, 75 people out of an already inadequately staffed office, to help with Katrina oversight. They found 10,000 mobile homes, at a cost of \$301.7 million, vacant and sinking into the mud in Arkansas; \$3 million in overcharges for food and lodging provided to disaster responders; a million dollars in overbilling by one company for hotel rooms for disaster evacuees. As of this date, the Office of the Inspector General has unfortunately had to continue to detail 75 people to the Katrina and the disaster recovery oversight. That is bringing about approximately a \$15 million shortfall. Yes, there is a minimal increase in their budget, but it is about \$15 million short of what they need.

They not only find fraud and abuse and overt waste, but make America more secure by spending those dollars more wisely. I am familiar with their work in the area of aviation security. They have been showing us the holes in the aviation security system in baggage screening, in passenger screening and other areas. Absolutely vital function. Again, they have been cut back because of the redeployment and the reassignment of the people to deal with the Katrina recovery effort. And it is not at all certain that those people will be coming back for years.

So I think it is essential that we find more funds to have more personnel full time, qualified personnel in this office; and in the end the taxpayers will come out ahead. We will avoid waste, and we will more efficiently spend the dollars we have.

I know the chairman will raise concerns about the Secretary's budget. I would suggest another place perhaps that could be cut in the overhead budget is the \$21.2 million limousine contract. Now, granted that is a 3-year contract, but that is \$7 million a year up from \$3.8 million last year. There have been some revelations, and this certainly isn't for security purposes since as I understand it the owner of the company is a convicted felon. So I do not think we are providing security to senior level DHS people by putting them in limousines of a company owned by a felon.

I would wonder how many people there are that need limousines there at the Department of Homeland Security. \$7 million a year? I mean, if there are 100 people, that is \$700,000 a year. I can't even image there are 100 people who need limousine services. There are a lot of caps floating around D.C. loose.

I would suggest we could dramatically reduce the limousine budget, and I am sure there are a few other places we could find in the Secretary's overhead, and we could rededicate that money to the Office of the Inspector General, and we could squeeze out the fraud and abuse and better serve our taxpayers and make the country more secure.

So I am hopeful that the chairman would be willing to look favorably upon this amendment to help the OIG deal with their current backlog. This is as of March, I did not ask for an update, they had 4,151 allegations of fraud and abuse on file. And they have been able to investigate 429 of the 4,151 allegations of abuse.

You cannot tell me that they are overfunded or even near adequately funded when there is nearly 3,800 pending investigations on allegations of abuse.

This Department contracts, almost one-third of their total budget is contracted. They should have the most robust OIG force in the Federal Government. Instead, they have the smallest OIG force of any agency in the Federal Government despite the fact that a third of all the funds that go are contracted out and that does not even include the emergency Katrina issue which I addressed earlier.

So, again, I would hope the chairman could look favorably upon increasing the OIG budget and accept this amendment.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I do, Mr. Chairman. The amendment proposes to

amend portions of the bill not yet read. The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because the amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Do any Members wish to be heard on the point of order? Mr. DEFAZIO. Would that preclude then offering the amendment again later?

We can either do it now or we can do it later, if he wants to raise a technical point, if I have to wait for one more intervening person and offer it again.

The CHAIRMAN. If the reading progresses past this paragraph, then an amendment could be offered to this paragraph only by unanimous consent.

Does the gentleman wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DEFAZIO. It was my understanding that after the en bloc we were in section 1 of the bill at an appropriate point; and since the previous amendments had addressed taking the money from the office, the same office from which I would take the money, I am a bit puzzled as to why this one is not in order and the earlier ones were.

Mr. SABO. My understanding is that Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. MARSHALL both have amendments to page 3 on line 15, so I assume what the Chair is saying is that if the gentleman redrafted his amendment before we moved to some place beyond PASCRELL and MARSHALL, he would be in order to offer a revised amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Then I would withdraw. Unfortunately, that would mean that we would have to replicate the debate. It would be better if the chairman just rose in opposition as he is going to later and he voted "no" and I voted "aye" and we had a recorded vote.

If the gentleman insists on his point of order, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment at this point in time and offer the amendment later. I was offering a way to save the body time.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PASCRELL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PASCRELL:

Page 3, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$40,000,000)".

Page 4, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$10,300,000)".

Page 16, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$10,300,000)".

Page 32, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$40,000,000)".

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering today will help address the preparedness needs of emergency responders at all levels.

I appeal to the chairman and I appeal to the ranking member, the preparedness needs of emergency responders, from the State emergency managers down to the rank-and-file first responders, the amendment would add much needed funding for the Emergency Management Performance Grant program, the EMPG, by \$40 million, and the SAFECOM program office by \$10.3 million.

Mr. Chairman, the Emergency Management Performance Grant program is the only source of funding to assist State and local governments with planning and preparedness readiness activities associated with natural disasters.

Mr. Chairman, I will also include into the RECORD letters of support from the major organizations, the National Emergency Management Association and the International Association of Emergency Managers. The latter deals with local and county emergency boards.

The EMPG program is the primary source of Federal funding to these State and local governments for planning, training, exercising, hiring personnel. This program is used to support emergency management personnel, natural disaster planning, training and drills, mass evacuation planning, population sheltering and emergency operations. It is critical for State and local governments, emergency management, capacity building.

I know that the floor manager knows about this, since the organization is in Lexington, Kentucky, his home area.

With hurricane season a week away, it is clear we need to be strengthening our Nation's emergency preparedness capabilities. In fact, a 2004 National Emergency Management Association study found there is approximately \$264 million shortfall in the EMPG for all 50 States. This is prior to the enormous emergency brought about through Katrina and Rita.

Mr. Chairman, funds could be cut from the office of the DHS chief information officer who received a plus-up of \$41 million in funding he didn't even request. The Department never requested this money. I am appealing to the ranking member and to the chairman to take the money that was not requested and put it into an area which affects all of us in every one of the 50 States.

The 9/11 Commission report made it clear, Federal funding for interoperable communication should be given the highest priority, and this is what the SAFECOM office is all about. Yet, Project SAFECOM has only five full-time employees.

We are talking out of both sides of our mouth here. We need to address this at every level. How can we take seriously their claim that the Department is doing all it can to be prepared for the next emergency when it has not properly staffed Project SAFECOM.

NOTICE

Incomplete record of House proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows, today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. ESHOO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 4:00 p.m.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HASTINGS of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOHMERT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1773. An act to resolve certain Native American claims in New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mrs. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5037. An act to amend titles 38 and 18, United States Code, to prohibit certain demonstrations at cemeteries under the control of the National Cemetery Administration and at Arlington National Cemetery, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of today, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Accordingly, pursuant to the previous order of the House of today, the House stands adjourned until 4 p.m. on Monday, May 29, 2006, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 418, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

Thereupon (at midnight), pursuant to the previous order of the House of today, the House adjourned until 4 p.m. on Monday, May 29, 2006, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 418, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

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

7657. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Keith W. Lippert, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7658. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Randall M. Schmidt, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7659. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Robert M. Shea, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7660. A letter from the Senior Vice President for Resource Management, Export-Import Bank, transmitting the Bank's Buy American Act reporting for fiscal year 2005, pursuant to section 641 of Division H of the fiscal year 2005 Consolidated Appropriations Act, Pub. L. 108-447; to the Committee on Financial Services.

7661. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting the Council's 2005 Annual Report, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 3305; to the Committee on Financial Services.

7662. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's annual report to Congress on the FY 2003 program operations of the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs (OWCP), the administration of the Black Lung Benefits Act (BLBA), the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (LHWCA), and the Federal Employees' Compensation Act for the period October 1, 2002, through September 30, 2003, pursuant to 30 U.S.C. 936(b);

to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7663. A letter from the Regulatory Officer, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Resource Agency Procedures for Conditions and Prescriptions in Hydropower Licenses (RIN: 0596-AC42) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7664. A letter from the Attorney, Office of Assistant Counsel for Legislation and Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Guidelines for Voluntary Greenhouse Gas Reporting (RIN: 1901-AB11) received May 4, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7665. A letter from the Program Analyst, NHTSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Theft Protection [Docket No. NHTSA-2005-22093] (RIN: 2127-AJ31) received May 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7666. A letter from the Program Analyst, NHTSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Power-Operated Window, Partition, and Roof Panel Systems [Docket No. NHTSA 2006-24455] (RIN: 2127-AJ78) received May 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7667. A letter from the Program Analyst, NHTSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard; Final Listing of 2007 Light Duty Truck Lines Subject to the Requirements of this Standard and Exempted Vehicle Lines for Model Year 2007 [Docket No. NHTSA-2006-23934] (RIN: 2127-AJ89) received May 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7668. A letter from the Program Analyst, NHTSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Low-Speed Vehicles [Docket No. NHTSA-06-24488] (RIN: 2127-AJ85) received May 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7669. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Air Quality Redesignation for the 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards; New York State [Docket No. EPA-R02-OAR-2005-NY-0001; FRL-8169-9] received May 10, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7670. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Alabama; Redesignation of the Birmingham, Alabama 8-Hour Ozone Non-attainment Area to Attainment for Ozone [EPA-OAR-2005-AL-0003-200608; FRL-8169-4] received May 10, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7671. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Operating Permits Program; State of Missouri [EPA-R07-OAR-2006-0380; FRL-8169-3] received May 10, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7672. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Hazardous Waste Management System; Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste; Final Exclusion [SW-FRL-8169-5] received May 10, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7673. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Ocean Dumping; Designation of Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site and Designation of New Site near Coos Bay, Oregon [FRL-8167-7] received May 10, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7674. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Revisions to the Arizona State Implementation Plan, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, Pima County Department of Environmental Quality, and Pinal County Air Quality Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2006-0272 ; FRL-8159-7] received May 10, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7675. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Tennessee: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R04-RCRA-2006-0429; FRL-8168-4] received May 10, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7676. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Standards for Business Practices and Communication Protocols for Public Utilities [Docket No. RM05-5-000] received May 11, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7677. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, a copy of Transmittal No. 11-06 which informs of an intent to sign the Materials and Technologies for Laser Protection Project Arrangement between the United States and Sweden, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

7678. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, a copy of Transmittal No. 12-06 which informs of an intent to sign the Memorandum of Agreement between the United States and Australia concerning Land Force Capability Modernization, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

7679. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, a copy of Transmittal No. 13-06 which informs of an intent to sign the Memorandum of Agreement between the United States and Canada concerning Defense Space Cooperation, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

7680. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112(b)(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

7681. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to Section 62(a) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), notification concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed lease of defense articles to the Government of Switzerland (Transmittal No. 03-06); to the Committee on International Relations.

7682. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's report on the policies and procedures of the U.S. Government with respect to the export of technologies and technical information to countries and entities of concern, pursuant to Public Law 106-65; to the Committee on International Relations.

7683. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-243), the Authorization for the Use of Force Against Iraq Resolution (Pub. L. 102-1), and in order to keep the Congress fully informed, a report prepared by the Department of State for the December 15, 2005 — February 15, 2006 reporting period including matters relating to post-liberation Iraq under Section 7 of the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 (Pub. L. 105-338); to the Committee on International Relations.

7684. A letter from the Acting U.S. Global AIDS Coordinator, Department of State, transmitting a report on the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief — Bringing Hope: Supplying Antiretroviral Drugs for HIV/AIDS Treatment, as requested in the Senate Amendment, accompanying H.R. 3057, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 44920(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

7685. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Report on Small Arms Programs," pursuant to Public Law 109-102; to the Committee on International Relations.

7686. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the export of defense articles and services to the Government of Italy (Transmittal No. DDTC 012-06); to the Committee on International Relations.

7687. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the export of defense articles and services to the Government of Germany (Transmittal No. DDTC 064-05); to the Committee on International Relations.

7688. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the export of defense articles and services to the Government of the United Kingdom (Transmittal No. DDTC 006-06); to the Committee on International Relations.

7689. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the export of defense articles and services

to the Government of Mexico (Transmittal No. DDTC 015-06); to the Committee on International Relations.

7690. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the export of defense articles and services to the Governments of Algeria and Spain (Transmittal No. DDTC 039-05); to the Committee on International Relations.

7691. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the export of defense articles and services to the Government of Israel (Transmittal No. DDTC 005-06); to the Committee on International Relations.

7692. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification of a proposed authorization for the export of significant military equipment (Transmittal No. DDTC 074-05); to the Committee on International Relations.

7693. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Secretary's determination that five countries are not cooperating fully with U.S. antiterrorism efforts: Cuba, Iran, North Korea, Syria, and Venezuela, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2781; to the Committee on International Relations.

7694. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2005 through March 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7695. A letter from the Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a copy of a report entitled "Fiscal Year 2005 Annual Report on Advisory Neighborhood Commissions," pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7696. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the six-month period ending March 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7697. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7698. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7699. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7700. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7701. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7702. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7703. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7704. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7705. A letter from the Deputy CHCO/Director, OHCM, Department of Energy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7706. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7707. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7708. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7709. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7710. A letter from the Regulatory Contact, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — National Industrial Security Program Directive No. 1 (RIN: 3095-AB34) received April 10, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7711. A letter from the Deputy Archivist, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Official Seals and Logos (RIN: 3095-AB48) received May 11, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7712. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's semi-annual report on the activities of the Inspector General for October 1, 2005 through March 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7713. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Implementation of Title II of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 — Judgment Fund (RIN: 3206-AJ93) received May 10, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7714. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Implementation of Title II of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 — Judgment Fund (RIN: 3206-AJ93) received May 11, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7715. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a legislative proposal to allow the Governmentwide Service Benefit Plan in the Federal Employees Health Benefits (FEHB) Program to offer more than two levels of benefits; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7716. A letter from the Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Letter Report: Comparative Analysis of Collections to Revised Revenue Estimates for Fiscal Year 2005"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7717. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the Final Engineering Report (FER) and Water Conservation Plan (WCP) for the Rocky Boy's/North Central Montana Regional Water System, pursuant to Public Law 107-331, Title IX; to the Committee on Resources.

7718. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Emergency Secretarial Action; Correction [Docket No. 060209031-6092-02; I.D. 020606C] (RIN: 0648-AU09) received May 11, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7719. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — NOAA Information Collection Requirements Under Paperwork Reduction Act: OMB Control Numbers; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Fisheries in the Western Pacific [Docket No. 060327086-6086-01; I.D. 032306A] (RIN: 0648-AU21) received April 26, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7720. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Rock Sole, Flathead Sole, and "Other Flatfish" by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 060216045-6045-01; I.D. 041206A] received April 26, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7721. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Deep-water Species Fishery by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 060216044-6044-01; I.D. 042606F] received May 11, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7722. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 060216045-6045-01; I.D. 042606B] received May 11, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7723. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 060216045-6045-01; I.D. 042606A] received May 11, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7724. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments; Pacific Halibut Fisheries [Docket No. 051014263-6028-03; I.D. 041906A] received May 8, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7725. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of De-

fense, transmitting the General Reevaluation Report and Environmental Impact Statement for the Miami Harbor Navigation Project, Dade County, Florida; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7726. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of the ecosystem restoration project for a 4.8-mile reach of the Rillito River, on the northern edge of Tucson, Arizona; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7727. A letter from the Director, Regulations and Disclosure Law, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of a New Port of Entry in the Tri-Cities Area of Tennessee and Virginia and Termination of the User-Fee Status of Tri-Cities Regional Airport [CBP Dec. 06-14] received May 11, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7728. A letter from the Program Analyst, NHTSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to Grant Criteria for Alcohol-Impaired Driving Prevention Programs [Docket No. NHTSA-2005-23454] (RIN: 2127-AJ73) received May 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7729. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel, FHWA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Design Standards for Highways; Interstate System [FHWA Docket No. FHWA-2005-22476] (RIN: 2125-AF06) received May 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7730. A letter from the Program Analyst, NHTSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Procedures for Participating in and Receiving Data from the National Driver Register Problem Driver Pointer System Pursuant to a Personnel Security Investigation and Determination [Docket No. NHTSA-05-22265] (RIN: 2127-AJ66) received May 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7731. A letter from the Acting Chief Counsel, SLSDC, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tariff of Tolls [Docket No. SLSDC 2006-23839] (RIN: 2135-AA23) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7732. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F.28 Mark 0070 and 0100 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-23476; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-204-AD; Amendment 39-14516; AD 2006-06-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7733. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model ERJ 170 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-23475; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-117-AD; Amendment 39-14518; AD 2006-06-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7734. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-101B SUD, 747-200B, 747-300, 747-400, and 747-400D

Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22838; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-102-AD; Amendment 39-14520; AD 2006-06-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7735. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca Arriel 1B, 1D, and 1D1 Turboshift Engines [Docket No. FAA-2005-22364; Directorate Identifier 2005-NE-26-AD; Amendment 39-14526; AD 2006-06-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7736. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Lycoming Engines (Formerly Textron Lycoming) AEIO-360, IO-360, O-360, LIO-360, and LO-360 Series Reciprocating Engines [Docket No. FAA-2005-23269; Directorate Identifier 2005-NE-50-AD; Amendment 39-14525; AD 2006-06-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7737. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-100, 747-100B, 747-100B SUD, 747-200B, 747-200C, 747-300, 747-400, 747-400D, and 747SR Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22426; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-105-AD; Amendment 39-14519; AD 2006-06-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7738. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Model CF6-80C2D1F Turbofan Engines [Docket No. FAA-2005-22055; Directorate Identifier 2005-NE-31-AD; Amendment 39-14517; AD 2006-06-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7739. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Thrush Aircraft, Inc. Model 600 S2D and S2R (S-2R) Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-23649; Directorate Identifier 2006-CE-08-AD; Amendment 39-14542; AD 2006-07-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7740. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-100, 747-100B, 747-100B SUD, 747-200B, 747-200F, 747-300, 747-400, 747-400D, 747SP, 747SR, 767-200, 767-300, 777-200, 777-300, and 777-300ER Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-24409; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-057-AD; Amendment 39-14555; AD 2005-05-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7741. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace LP Model Gulfstream 100 Airplanes; and Model Astra SPX, and 1125 Westwind Astra Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22511; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-120-AD; Amendment 39-14440; AD 2006-01-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7742. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-14, DC-9-15; and DC-9-15F Airplanes; Model DC-9-20, DC-9-30, DC-9-40, and DC-9-50 Series Airplanes; Model DC-9-81 (MD-81), DC-9-82 (MD-82), DC-9-83 (MD-83), and DC-9-87 (MD-87) Airplanes; Model MD-88 Airplanes; and Model MD-90-30 Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-105-AD; Amendment 39-14441; AD 2006-01-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7743. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Model Bae 146-100A and -200A Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22791; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-083-AD; Amendment 39-14448; AD 2006-01-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7744. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 B2 and B4 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22035; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-016-AD; Amendment 39-14442; AD 2006-01-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7745. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International Inc. (formerly AlliedSignal, Inc., formerly Textron Lycoming, formerly Avco Lycoming) T5309, T5311, T5313B, T5317A, T5317A-1, and T5317B Series, and T53-L-9, T53-L-11, T53-L-13B, T53-L-13BA, T53-L-13B S/SA, T53-L-13B S/SB, T53-L-13B/D, and T53-L-703 Series Turboshift Engines [Docket No. FAA-2004-18038; Directorate Identifier 2004-NE-01-AD; Amendment 39-14444; AD 2006-01-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7746. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 B4-600, B4-600R, and F4-600R Series Airplanes, and Model C4-605R Variant F Airplanes (Collectively Called A300-600 Series Airplanes); and Airbus Model A310 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22053; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-74-AD; Amendment 39-14449; AD 2006-01-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7747. 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 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22792; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-084-AD; Amendment 39-14447; AD 2006-01-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7748. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-100, 747-100B, 747-200B, 747-200C, 747-200F, 747-400F, 747SR, and 747SP Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22289; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-101-AD; Amendment 39-14446; AD 2006-01-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

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

7749. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A320-111 Airplanes, and Model A320-200 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-298-AD; Amendment 39-14354; AD 2005-22-10 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7750. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Aerospaiale Model ATR42-200, ATR42-300, and ATR42-320 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22454; Directorate Identifier 2001-NM-108-AD; Amendment 39-14395; AD 2005-25-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7751. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-120, -120ER, -120FC, -120QC, and -120RT Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22631; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-183-AD; Amendment 39-14394; AD 2005-25-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7752. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Shadin ADC-2000 Air Data Computers [Docket No. FAA-2005-21787; Directorate Identifier 2005-CE-34-AD; Amendment 39-14401; AD 2005-25-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7753. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Przedsiębiorstwo Doswiadczalno-Produkcyjne Szybownictwa "PZL-Bielsko" Model SZD-50-3 "Puchacz" Gliders [Docket No. FAA-2005-21836; Directorate Identifier 2005-CE-36-AD; Amendment 39-14415; AD 2005-25-22] received February 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7754. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company, Model 390, Premier 1 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-20712; Directorate Identifier 2005-CE-15-AD; Amendment 39-14400; AD 2005-25-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7755. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-2C10 (Regional Jet Series 700, 701, & 702) Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-NM-46-AD; Amendment 39-14392; AD 2005-24-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7756. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-135 Airplanes and Model EMB-145, -145ER, -145MR, -145LR, -145XR, -145MP, and -145EP Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22033; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-218-AD; Amendment 39-14391; AD 2005-24-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64)

received February 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7757. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting an informational copy of a Report of Building Project Survey for Riverside-San Bernardino Counties, CA, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7758. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Workforce Security, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes to UI Performs — received May 10, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7759. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Nonconventional Source Fuel Credit, Section 29 Inflation Adjustment Factor, and Section 29 Reference Price [Notice 2006-37] received April 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7760. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Weighted Average Interest Rate Update [Notice 2006-49] received May 11, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7761. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Administrative, Procedural and Miscellaneous (Rev. Proc. 2006-27) received May 11, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7762. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Exemption from Tax on Corporations, Certain Trusts, Etc. (Rev. Rul. 2006-27) received May 10, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7763. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Interim Guidance with Respect to the Application of Tres. Reg. section 1.883-3 [Notice 2006-43] received May 4, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7764. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Administration's certification that the level of screening services and protection provided at Tupelo Regional Airport will be equal to or greater than the level that would be provided at the airport by TSA Transportation Security Officers; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

7765. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Development of a Strategy Plan Regarding Physician Investment in Specialty Hospitals," pursuant to Section 5006 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005, Pub. L. 109-171; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

7766. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a copy of draft legislation entitled, "Good Samaritan Clean Watershed Act"; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, Resources, and the Judiciary.

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 842. Resolution providing our consideration of the bill (H.R. 5254) to set schedules for the consideration of permits for refineries (Rept. 109-482). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEWIS of California: Committee on Appropriations. Report on the Revised Sub-allocation of Budget Allocations for Fiscal Year 2007 (Rept. 109-483). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on Homeland Security. House Resolution 809. Resolution directing the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security to transmit to the House of Representatives not later than 14 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution documents in the Secretary's possession relating to any existing or previous agreement between the Department of Homeland Security and Shirlington Limousine and Transportation, Incorporated, of Arlington, Virginia; adversely (Rept. 109-484). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 5477. A bill to provide for the establishment at the National Science Foundation of a program to promote and assist the teaching of inventiveness and innovation; to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committee on 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. HALL:

H.R. 5478. A bill to clarify the Congressional intent on Federal preemption under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act with respect to energy conservation for consumer products; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WELLER (for himself, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. RENZI):

H.R. 5479. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain amounts paid for exercise equipment and physical fitness programs as amounts paid for medical care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Ms. McCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. McGOVERN, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. WATSON, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas):

H.R. 5480. A bill to promote economic diversification, entrepreneurship, and private sector development in Africa, and to promote partnerships among small and medium enterprises in the United States and the African private sector in qualified sub-Saharan African countries; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Small Business, and Financial 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. NORWOOD:

H.R. 5481. A bill to amend the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 to improve the safety of mines and mining; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 5482. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to provide individuals the ability to control access to their credit reports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 5483. A bill to increase the disability earning limitation under the Railroad Retirement Act and to index the amount of allowable earnings consistent with increases in the substantial gainful activity dollar amount under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. McHENRY:

H.R. 5484. A bill to allow border States to use a portion of certain Department of Homeland Security grants to build physical barriers to deter illegal crossings; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself and Mr. WU):

H.R. 5485. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of establishing the Columbia-Pacific National Heritage Area in the States of Washington and Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. WATT, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. McDERMOTT):

H.R. 5486. A bill to prevent the Executive from encroaching upon the Congressional prerogative to make laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. HOOLEY (for herself, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. BEAN, Mr. BAKER, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BACA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. DICKS, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. BAIRD, and Ms. HERSETH):

H.R. 5487. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to take certain actions to mitigate the effects of the breach of data security that occurred, or is likely to have occurred, in May, 2006, at the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ADERHOLT:

H.R. 5488. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the period of limitation for filing a claim for credit or refund of an estate tax overpayment attributable to litigation continuing after the return for the estate is filed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 5489. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to make grants to States

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

to provide for the publication of security and emergency information in telephone directories; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 5490. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a personal identification number for each veteran in order to help preserve the confidentiality of Department of Veterans Affairs information on veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. HENSARLING):

H.R. 5491. A bill to protect investors by fostering transparency and accountability of attorneys in private securities litigation; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5492. A bill to amend the Constitution Heritage Act of 1988 to provide for the operation of the National Constitution Center; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. CUBIN (for herself, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 5493. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act regarding residential treatment programs for pregnant and parenting women, a program to reduce substance abuse among nonviolent offenders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 5494. A bill to require the distribution by the National Technical Information Service of monthly updates of the Death Master List prepared by the Social Security Administration to all nationwide consumer reporting agencies, to require such consumer reporting agencies to maintain a permanent fraud alert in each file of a consumer whose name appears on the Death Master List, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5495. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to add human papillomavirus vaccines to the list of taxable vaccines for purposes of the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

H.R. 5496. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide special treatment of certain cancer hospitals under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. HARMAN (for herself and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 5497. A bill to limit the reduction in the number of personnel of the Air Force Space Command, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CASE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WU, Mr. WATT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. BECERRA):

H.R. 5498. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to improve the provision of disaster relief and preparedness services with respect to persons with limited English proficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 5499. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand and make permanent the Department of Veterans Affairs benefit

for Government markers for marked graves of veterans buried in private cemeteries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KELLER (for himself, Mr. BOREN, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. NEY, and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee):

H.R. 5500. A bill to prevent undue disruption of interstate commerce by limiting civil actions brought against persons whose only role with regard to a product in the stream of commerce is as a lawful seller of the product; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCHUGH (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. WALSH, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mrs. MCCARTHY):

H.R. 5501. A bill to establish the Champlain Quadricentennial Commemoration Commission, the Hudson-Fulton 400th Commemoration Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Miss MCMORRIS:

H.R. 5502. A bill to improve the academic competitiveness of students in the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 5503. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to increase the mortgage amount limits applicable to FHA mortgage insurance for multifamily housing located in high-cost areas; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MOORE of Kansas (for himself, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas):

H.R. 5504. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6029 Broadmoor Street in Mission, Kansas, as the "Larry Winn, Jr. Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 5505. A bill to require the debarment from Federal contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements of employers who hire unauthorized aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 5506. A bill to preclude the acceptance of a driver's license as a document establishing identity, for purposes of employment eligibility verification, if the State issuing the license permits use of a taxpayer identification number that is not a social security account number in the application process; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 5507. A bill to establish procedures for the issuance by the Commissioner of Social Security of "no match" letters to employers, and for the notification of the Secretary of Homeland Security regarding such letters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5508. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to increase the Federal medical assistance percentage for the District of Columbia under the Medicaid Program to 75 percent; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 5509. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the tax credit for

electricity produced from open-loop biomass; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OBERSTAR:

H.R. 5510. A bill to direct the Administrator of General Services to install a photovoltaic system for the headquarters building of the Department of Energy; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 5511. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to ensure that the validity of foreign judgments against United States citizens is adjudicated in Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 5512. A bill to direct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish an urban blight demolition program to provide grants for the demolition of condemned and tax-foreclosed residential housing; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan (for himself, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. REGULA, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. HOBSON, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 5513. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to restore the Medicare treatment of ownership of oxygen equipment to that in effect before enactment of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHAW:

H.R. 5514. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for lung cancer screening tests for certain high-risk individuals under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STRICKLAND (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 5515. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to authorize trade readjustment allowances under chapter 2 of title II of such Act to adversely affected workers who are subject to a lockout; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 5516. A bill to allow for the renegotiation of the payment schedule of contracts between the Secretary of the Interior and the Redwood Valley County Water District, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mrs. EMERSON, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. MICHAUD):

H.R. 5517. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to establish a temporary loan program and a temporary vocational development program for small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. WEXLER:

H.R. 5518. A bill to repeal the Medicare cost containment provisions contained in subtitle A of title VIII of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of

such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CASE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas):

H.R. 5519. A bill to improve and expand geographic literacy among kindergarten through grade 12 students in the United States by improving professional development programs for kindergarten through grade 12 teachers offered through institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico (for herself, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. RENZI, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. LEACH, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SIMMONS, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CARTER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SWEENEY, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. HALL, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. GERLACH, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. GOODE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. DRAKE, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. KIRK, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. HULSHOF, Ms. HART, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. WAMP, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. PORTER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington):

H.R. 5520. A bill to establish the Office of Veterans Identity Protection Claims to reimburse injured persons for injuries suffered as a result of the unauthorized use, disclosure, or dissemination of identifying information stolen from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. WATSON, and Ms. MCKINNEY):

H.J. Res. 87. A joint resolution requiring the President to notify Congress if the President makes a determination at the time of signing a bill into law to ignore a duly enacted provision of such newly enacted law, establishing expedited procedures for the consideration of legislation in the House of Representatives in response to such a determination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan):

H. Con. Res. 417. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in support of a broad-based political settlement in Iraq; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H. Con. Res. 418. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment or recess of the two Houses; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. KELLY (for herself, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. FOSSELLA, and Mr. ISRAEL):

H. Con. Res. 419. Concurrent resolution recognizing and supporting the efforts of the State of New York develop the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor in New Windsor, New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H. Con. Res. 420. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued to promote public awareness of, and additional research relating to, Crohn's Disease; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mr. CASTLE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. WU, and Ms. BALDWIN):

H. Con. Res. 421. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress and support for Greater Opportunities for Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (GO-STEM) programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. DRAKE:

H. Res. 843. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should seek to achieve complete energy independence by 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. LEE, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. DOYLE, and Ms. BALDWIN):

H. Res. 844. A resolution congratulating the International AIDS Vaccine Initiative on ten years of significant achievement in the search for an HIV/AIDS vaccine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H. Res. 845. A resolution requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General to transmit to the House of Representatives not later than 14 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution, documents relating to the termination of the Department of Justice's Office of Professional Responsibility's investigation of the involvement of Department of Justice personnel in the creation and administration of the National Security Agency's warrantless surveillance program, including documents relating to Office of Professional Responsibility's request for and denial of security clearances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE:

H. Res. 846. A resolution requesting the President and directing the Secretary of State to provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in their possession relating to strategies and plans either designed to cause regime change in or for the

use of military force against Iran; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Res. 847. A resolution honoring the life and accomplishments of Katherine Dunham and extending condolences to her family on her death; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. NADLER):

H. Res. 848. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the creation of refugee populations in the Middle East, North Africa, and the Persian Gulf region as a result of human rights violations; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS TO PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

- H.R. 65: Mr. BARROW.
- H.R. 144: Mr. EDWARDS.
- H.R. 274: Mr. DENT.
- H.R. 503: Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Mr. DEFAZIO.
- H.R. 583: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. NUSSLE, and Mr. FOLEY.
- H.R. 611: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
- H.R. 615: Mr. GERLACH.
- H.R. 697: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. CARDIN.
- H.R. 791: Mr. WALSH.
- H.R. 910: Mr. MOLLOHAN and Mr. PICKERING.
- H.R. 916: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mrs. KELLY.
- H.R. 920: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
- H.R. 997: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan.
- H.R. 1000: Mr. INSLEE.
- H.R. 1020: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. ROTHMAN.
- H.R. 1229: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
- H.R. 1237: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. TURNER, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SWEENEY, and Mr. NEY.
- H.R. 1298: Mr. MEEKS of New York.
- H.R. 1306: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.
- H.R. 1333: Mr. CASE and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
- H.R. 1351: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
- H.R. 1384: Mr. SHADEGG.
- H.R. 1425: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
- H.R. 1517: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
- H.R. 1518: Mr. EHLERS.
- H.R. 1554: Mr. DENT.
- H.R. 1578: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
- H.R. 1582: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
- H.R. 1589: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
- H.R. 1671: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. CRAMER.
- H.R. 1772: Mr. BEAUPREZ.
- H.R. 2014: Mr. UPTON.
- H.R. 2048: Mr. FERGUSON.
- H.R. 2052: Mr. HIGGINS.
- H.R. 2053: Mr. MARSHALL.
- H.R. 2061: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. BOSWELL.
- H.R. 2088: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SHADEGG, and Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan.
- H.R. 2231: Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. FERGUSON, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. UPTON.
- H.R. 2350: Mr. BOSWELL.
- H.R. 2386: Mr. ADERHOLT and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
- H.R. 2533: Mr. TERRY and Mr. BOSWELL.
- H.R. 2671: Ms. WATSON and Mr. WEINER.
- H.R. 2730: Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GERLACH, and Ms. DELAURO.

- H.R. 2808: Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. DREIER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
- H.R. 2841: Mr. SPRATT.
- H.R. 2861: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.
- H.R. 2962: Ms. MCKINNEY and Mr. KUHL of New York.
- H.R. 3022: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. KILDEE.
- H.R. 3160: Mr. PLATTS.
- H.R. 3192: Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 3228: Mr. EHLERS.
- H.R. 3248: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
- H.R. 3360: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
- H.R. 3361: Mrs. KELLY.
- H.R. 3385: Mr. WYNN and Mr. ISSA.
- H.R. 3451: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California and Mr. TURNER.
- H.R. 3559: Mrs. KELLY and Mr. WHITFIELD.
- H.R. 3616: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 3795: Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. SANDERS.
- H.R. 3861: Mr. RAHALL.
- H.R. 3883: Mr. BARROW.
- H.R. 3908: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. BARROW.
- H.R. 3997: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. HOLDEN.
- H.R. 4006: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 4033: Mr. MURPHY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. DENT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. DOYLE.
- H.R. 4098: Mr. WICKER.
- H.R. 4157: Mr. FORTUÑO.
- H.R. 4197: Ms. KAPTUR.
- H.R. 4264: Mr. COBLE.
- H.R. 4275: Mr. FORTUÑO.
- H.R. 4291: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina and Mr. BACA.
- H.R. 4298: Mr. SOUDER.
- H.R. 4318: Mr. DENT.
- H.R. 4341: Miss McMORRIS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. BOUCHER.
- H.R. 4357: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
- H.R. 4446: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
- H.R. 4469: Mr. HONDA.
- H.R. 4479: Mr. LANGEVIN.
- H.R. 4547: Mr. COLE of Oklahoma and Mr. MATHESON.
- H.R. 4608: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
- H.R. 4695: Mr. KILDEE.
- H.R. 4704: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
- H.R. 4705: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
- H.R. 4739: Ms. BORDALLO.
- H.R. 4741: Mr. BARROW.
- H.R. 4751: Mr. CALVERT.
- H.R. 4761: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mr. PENCE.
- H.R. 4809: Mr. CANNON.
- H.R. 4838: Mr. MICA.
- H.R. 4893: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BACHUS, and Mrs. BONO.
- H.R. 4894: Mr. REYNOLDS.
- H.R. 4925: Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. NADLER.
- H.R. 4960: Mr. HOLT.
- H.R. 4961: Mr. HERGER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEACH, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. GOODE.
- H.R. 4974: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
- H.R. 4985: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. KIND, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. FARR.
- H.R. 4997: Mr. COSTA.
- H.R. 5005: Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. BASS.
- H.R. 5007: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
- H.R. 5013: Mr. MATHESON and Mr. SHADEGG.
- H.R. 5014: Mr. SERRANO.
- H.R. 5017: Mr. COSTA.
- H.R. 5114: Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. MARCHANT.
- H.R. 5121: Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BACA, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. POMBO.
- H.R. 5129: Mr. WAMP, Mr. GINGREY, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. CARTER.
- H.R. 5134: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
- H.R. 5159: Mr. BARROW and Mr. INSLEE.
- H.R. 5162: Mr. DAVIS of Florida.
- H.R. 5177: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. MOLLOHAN.
- H.R. 5182: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. CRAMER.
- H.R. 5201: Mr. CANNON, Mr. HERGER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WELLER, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. NUSSLE, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. TIERNEY.
- H.R. 5206: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 5208: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
- H.R. 5209: Mr. TOWNS.
- H.R. 5229: Mr. FERGUSON, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. INSLEE.
- H.R. 5230: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
- H.R. 5238: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. GONZALEZ.
- H.R. 5246: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. SAXTON, and Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 5247: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SHERMAN, and Ms. WASSERMAN Schultz.
- H.R. 5249: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
- H.R. 5255: Mr. CALVERT, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BAKER, Mr. WELLER, and Mr. FOLEY.
- H.R. 5262: Mr. WELDON of Florida, Miss McMORRIS, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. GINGREY.
- H.R. 5278: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
- H.R. 5280: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, and Mr. CARDOZA.
- H.R. 5289: Mr. SHIMKUS.
- H.R. 5291: Mr. FORTUÑO.
- H.R. 5292: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
- H.R. 5315: Mr. BAIRD.
- H.R. 5316: Mr. MANZULLO.
- H.R. 5328: Mr. CLAY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. WATSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. OWENS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LEE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. WATERS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. CARSON, Ms. CARSON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. FALCOMA VAEGA.
- H.R. 5336: Mr. BOUSTANY.
- H.R. 5337: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama and Ms. HOOLEY.
- H.R. 5339: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
- H.R. 5344: Ms. CARSON.
- H.R. 5348: Mr. HONDA and Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 5351: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. SODREL.
- H.R. 5362: Mr. NADLER.
- H.R. 5363: Mr. CASE and Mr. FOLEY.
- H.R. 5371: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. HONDA, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
- H.R. 5372: Mr. FILNER, Mr. BARROW, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
- H.R. 5390: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
- H.R. 5392: Mr. MELANCON.
- H.R. 5405: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
- H.R. 5412: Mr. HINOJOSA.
- H.R. 5413: Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
- H.R. 5432: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 5444: Mr. STRICKLAND.
- H.R. 5453: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. LAHOOD.
- H.R. 5455: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. KIND, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. COSTA, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. DEFazio, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. WATSON, Mr. HOYER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BACA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, and Mr. BECERRA.
- H.R. 5458: Mr. HONDA.
- H.R. 5463: Mr. MCHUGH.
- H.R. 5464: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. POMBO, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. HERGER, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. DENT, Mr. WELLER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania.
- H.J. Res. 39: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
- H.J. Res. 58: Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. SALAZAR.
- H. Con. Res. 137: Mr. BAIRD.
- H. Con. Res. 177: Mr. NADLER.
- H. Con. Res. 210: Mr. BLUNT.
- H. Con. Res. 338: Mr. SHERMAN.
- H. Con. Res. 368: Mrs. DRAKE.
- H. Con. Res. 384: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.
- H. Con. Res. 402: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
- H. Con. Res. 404: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FARR, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mrs. MALONEY.
- H. Con. Res. 407: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
- H. Con. Res. 409: Mr. WELLER and Ms. BORDALLO.
- H. Con. Res. 410: Mr. DOYLE.
- H. Res. 67: Mr. FATTAH.
- H. Res. 295: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
- H. Res. 318: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
- H. Res. 498: Mr. BAIRD.
- H. Res. 603: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
- H. Res. 608: Mr. SHERMAN.
- H. Res. 721: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
- H. Res. 760: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. WEXLER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
- H. Res. 776: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HALL, and Mr. SALAZAR.
- H. Res. 779: Ms. MCKINNEY.
- H. Res. 799: Mr. CHABOT, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. SHERMAN.
- H. Res. 800: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. POE, and Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 4963: Mr. HYDE.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 13, May 23, 2006, by Mr. JERRY F. COSTELLO on House Resolution 814, was signed by the following Members: Jerry F. Costello, Michael R. McNulty, James P. McGovern, Jim Costa, Danny K. Davis, Bernard Sanders, Raul M. Grijalva, Ben Chandler, Rush D. Holt, Adam B. Schiff, Leonard L. Boswell, John T. Salazar, Lois Capps, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Ellen O. Tauscher, Peter A. DeFazio, Daniel Lipinski, Wm. Lacy Clay, Russ Carnahan, Shelley Berkley, Michael E. Capuano, Timothy H. Bishop, Stephen F. Lynch, Tim Ryan, Bill Pascrell, Jr., Benjamin L. Cardin, Robert A. Brady, Bob Etheridge, Michael M. Honda, Jim Matheson, Tim Holden, Rahm Emanuel, Joseph Crowley, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Martin T. Meehan, Dan Boren, Charlie Melancon, Henry Cuellar, Ed Pastor, Bart Stupak, Neil Abercrombie, Nick J. Rahall II, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Hilda L. Solis, Jesse L. Jackson, Jr., Richard E. Neal, William D. Delahunt, Janice D. Schakowsky, Michael H. Michaud, Paul E. Kanjorski, Sherrod Brown, Luis V. Gutierrez, Zoe Lofgren, Julia Carson, Barney Frank, Grace F. Napolitano, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., James P. Moran, Rick Larsen, Gary L. Ackerman, Joe Baca, Solomon P. Ortiz, Ruben Hinojosa, Xavier Becerra, Diane E. Watson, Frank Pallone, Jr., Bob Filner, Brad Miller, Gene Green, Silvestre Reyes, James R. Langevin, Mike Thompson, Gene Taylor, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Michael F. Doyle, Steven R. Rothman, David Wu, Chris Van Hollen, Dennis J. Kucinich, James L. Oberstar, Henry A. Waxman, Nydia M. Velazquez, John F. Tierney, Robert Wexler, Edolphus Towns, Sheila Jackson-Lee, Harold E. Ford, Jr., Al Green, Anthony D. Weiner, Betty McCollum, Dale E. Kildee, Kendrick B. Meek, Allyson Y. Schwartz, David E. Price, Thomas H. Allen, Melissa L. Bean, Lynn C. Woolsey, Jim McDermott, Bobby L. Rush, David Scott, Earl Pomeroy, Dennis A. Cardoza, Fortney Pete Stark, Anna G. Eshoo, Carolyn McCarthy, Gregory W. Meeks, Sam Farr, Major R. Owens, Tammy Baldwin, Jane Harman, Stephanie Herseth, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Loretta Sanchez, Marcy Kaptur, Juanita Millender-McDonald, Gwen Moore, John B. Larson, Marion Berry, Linda T. Sanchez, Stephanie Tubbs Jones, Corrine Brown, Donald M. Payne, Earl Blumenauer, Darlene Hooley, Diana DeGette, John Barrow, Charles A. Gonzalez, Doris O. Matsui, Alcee L. Hastings, Robert C. Scott, Ron Kind, Jim Cooper, Robert E. (Bud) Cramer, Jr., Brad Sherman, Chet Edwards, Howard L. Berman, Carolyn B. Maloney, John S. Tanner, Emanuel Cleaver, Bennie G. Thompson, G. K. Butterfield, Albert Russell Wynn; Barbara Lee, Rosa L. DeLauro, Susan A. Davis, Tom Lantos, Mike Ross, Robert E. Andrews, Steny H. Hoyer, James E. Clyburn, Elijah E. Cummings, Charles B. Rangel, Allan B. Mollohan, Dennis Moore, Lloyd Doggett, Steve Israel, Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, Lincoln Davis, Maxine

Waters, John W. Olver, Allen Boyd, Norman D. Dicks, John Lewis, Brian Baird, Jim Davis, John M. Spratt, Jr., Mark Udall, Bart Gordon, Collin C. Peterson, Cynthia McKinney, Nancy Pelosi, Ted Strickland, Brian Higgins, Jay Inslee, John Conyers, Jr., John D. Dingell, Chaka Fattah, Carolyn C. Kilpatrick, David R. Obey, Jerrold Nadler, Ike Skelton, Artur Davis, Nita M. Lowey, Melvin L. Watt, Jose E. Serrano, Sander M. Levin, Mike McIntyre, George Miller, Jim Marshall, Tom Udall, Edward J. Markey, Maurice D. Hinchey, Ed Case, Adam Smith, Martin Olav Sabo, and Elliot L. Engel.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 3 by Mr. EDWARDS on House Resolution 271: Luis V. Gutierrez.

Petition 6 by Mr. ABERCROMBIE on House Resolution 543; Rush D. Holt, Bart Stupak, David Wu, Ruben Hinojosa, Luis V. Gutierrez, and Elliot L. Engel.

Petition 7 by Ms. HERSETH on House Resolution 568: Nancy Pelosi and Mike McIntyre.

Petition 8 by Mr. WAXMAN on House Resolution 570: Nancy Pelosi.

Petition 11 by Mr. BARROW on House Resolution 614: Martin Olav Sabo.

The following Member's name was withdrawn from the following discharge petition:

Petition 13 by Mr. COSTELLO on House Resolution 814: Eni F.H. Faleomavaega.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 5441

OFFERED BY: MS. FOXF

AMENDMENT NO. 10: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available to the Federal Emergency Management Agency in this Act may be used to purchase a Louis Vuitton handbag.

H.R. 5441

OFFERED BY: MR. JINDAL

AMENDMENT NO. 11: Page 28, line 9, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by \$9,000,000) (reduced by \$9,000,000)”.

H.R. 5441

OFFERED BY: MR. JINDAL

AMENDMENT NO. 12: Page 34, line 20, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$1,000,000) (reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

H.R. 5441

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT NO. 13: Page 2, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(reduced by \$40,000,000)”.

Page 3, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(reduced \$61.317,000)”.

Page 13, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by \$101,017,000)”.

H.R. 5441

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT NO. 14: Page 7, line 23, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 14, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

H.R. 5441

OFFERED BY: MR. TANCREDO

AMENDMENT NO. 15: Page 62, after line 17, insert the following:

SEC. 537. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the diversity visa program established in section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(c)).

H.R. 5441

OFFERED BY: MR. CROWLEY

AMENDMENT NO. 16: Page 4, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(reduced by \$88,000,000)”.

Page 28, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by \$88,000,000)”.

Page 29, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by \$88,000,000)”.

Page 29, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by \$88,000,000)”.

H.R. 5441

OFFERED BY: MR. KINGSTON

AMENDMENT NO. 17: Page 62, after line 17, insert the following:

SEC. 537. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide a foreign government information relating to the activities of Non-Integrated Surveillance Intelligence System, as defined by DHS OIG-06-15, operating along the international border between Mexico and the states of California, Texas, New Mexico and Arizona, unless required by international treaty.

H.R. 5441

OFFERED BY: MR. ENGEL

AMENDMENT NO. 18: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of section 303 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13212).