United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 14, 2006 No. 76

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 14, 2006.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM LATHAM to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

Monsignor Edward F. Jordan, Pastor, St. John Neumann Catholic Church, Austin, Texas, offered the following prayer:

O God, we ask Your guidance for the men and women who serve their country in this House of government. Give them the wisdom to understand what is truly good for the citizens who have elected them, and the courage to frame the best possible laws to achieve this good.

Bless and protect their families and friends who have shared with them the challenging tasks of seeking public office and serving their Nation before the gaze of all.

On this day, when we honor the flag, the symbol of our Nation, keep us mindful of those men and women who have given their lives in war and in peace that we may enjoy laws that support our liberty.

Furthermore, we seek Your guidance for all the citizens of this Nation as they offer their chosen representatives both enthusiastic support and civil opposition in their honorable work of governing. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. INSLEE 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.

HONORING MONSIGNOR EDWARD JORDAN

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

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great man, a man of God, a man of faith, a man who has devoted his entire career, indeed his entire life, to the service of his fellow man.

Monsignor Edward Jordan, who offered this morning's prayer for the House of Representatives is revered, admired, and loved by all in his congregation and by all those whose life he has touched. He is the voice and shepherd of our parish at St. John Neumann's Catholic Church in Austin, Texas.

Born in Springfield, Ohio, Monsignor Jordan entered the priesthood after receiving his doctorate in theology from the Angelicum University in Rome. From there he served and strengthened the Catholic Church and its flock in central Texas for over four decades.

It has been a great privilege to call Monsignor Jordan my pastor. And everyone who knows him experiences the true message of Christ. In his words and in his deeds, and above all, in his heart, his example is a beacon of light which draws us all closer to the Creator. His faith and devotion to the life of Christ is an inspiration to us all.

Both as a candidate and as a Member of Congress, Monsignor Jordan gave me the spiritual guidance and taught me the true meaning of sacrifice and public service. He baptized my triplets, not an easy accomplishment, and he administered the Sacrament of Holy Communion to my oldest daughters.

And while his retirement this Sunday marks the end of one spiritual journey, it also marks the beginning of another.

As you move on from your official role within the Church, you will always remain our shepherd, our spiritual leader, and, above all, our friend. Monsignor Jordan, I know that I speak for all of us in the Catholic community when I say that we will miss you, but we know that you will always be there for your flock.

I am reminded of the Gospel of Matthew when Jesus said, ''Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father who is in heaven.'' May the peace of Christ be with you and may He hold you in the palm of his hand.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

FEMA IS ''THE'' DISASTER

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, when hurricane disaster hit Louisiana and Texas, many people suffered, and many people profited on this misfortune. To the rescue was FEMA. But the phrase itself

Printed on recycled paper.

brings fear and trepidation into the hearts and souls of those affected by this disaster.

Why? Many people that needed help never got it and never will. But some people did get help, and they profited on this disaster, and FEMA paid for it. The GAO says FEMA wasted $1.6 billion of taxpayer money, or 16 percent of all funding.

Thieves used unlawful money to get season football tickets, vacation at Hawaiian resorts for 2½ months, paid for a divorce lawyer, go to topless clubs, and, get this, even pay for a sex change operation. FEMA even sent money to prison inmates pretending to be hurricane victims.

Mr. Speaker, this ought not to be. FEMA should only be responsible for passing out toothbrushes to these thieves, because that is all they will need when they go to prison. If employees at FEMA are accomplices they should go to jail too. Hurricane season is back. But do not expect FEMA to help in the next disaster, they are the disaster.

And that's just the way it is.

IMAGE OF THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, a respected opinion poll, just released, shows that the image of the United States has been seriously damaged around the world as we attacked and occupied Iraq.

The U.S. war against Iraq as seen worldwide is a threat to world peace. The poet Robert Burns once wrote, ''Oh, would some power God give us to see ourselves as others see us.'' Because the world is interconnected and interdependent, it would be helpful for us to see why the people of other nations, especially those who have been our friends, not only oppose our actions in Iraq but also question the so-called war on terror.

We have lost so much for a war based on lies. Right after 9/11, many asked, why do ''they'' hate us? That was the time to begin reaching out to unite the world in our common aspiration for safety and security. Not through war and occupation, but through truth and reconciliation.

The human unity which we celebrate as a Nation under God should remind us that the God which watches over the United States watches over the entire world. We can bomb to pieces but we cannot bomb the world to peace.

This is the time for us to try again to unite the world in our common aspiration for peace and for human unity.

AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I just returned from Afghanistan. I went there to personally thank our troops and to speak directly with President Karzai and our generals to see how things are going. They told me that the U.S. and Afghan forces are working successfully side by side against the Taliban fighters and al Qaeda terrorists.

They are also working together to build roads, bridges, and schools to help change hearts and minds over the long term. As I rode down the streets of Kabul, I saw little boys and girls skipping on their way to school, carrying their American book bags. When the Taliban was in charge, there were no girls in school, and the country had an 80 percent illiteracy rate.

Now there are 6.7 million Afghan children in school. I met with several of the 68 women who were recently elected to Afghanistan's Parliament. They are excited about their new-found freedom and democracy. The Taliban are hoping that democracy in Afghanistan will fail so they can return to power. But the people there have tasted freedom and they like it.

URGING ACCOUNTABILITY FOR TAXPAYER DOLLARS

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has cut and run from its responsibility of oversight, to ensure that the taxpayer money is spent wisely. By last count, nearly $10 billion of the funds set aside for Iraq reconstruction cannot be found. Vanished. $10 billion gone.

And now the Government Accountability Office reports that 16 percent of the aid distributed after Katrina, $1.4 billion, was spent fraudulently. Some of the money went to pay for a bottle of Dom Perignon, Caribbean vacations, ''Girls Gone Wild'' videos.

That may be one heck of a vacation, but it is a horrendous use of the taxpayer dollars. Instead of rooting out incompetence and fraud and waste and abuse, the Congress has actually protected it. No oversight. No accountability.

By failing in their oversight responsibility, by failing to ask the tough questions and hold the administration accountable for their actions, the Republican Congress is a willing accomplice to the greatest taxpayer ripoff since the Teapot Dome. We just sent an additional $94.5 billion to Iraq and the gulf coast without a single act of accountability or oversight. It is time for a change. It is time for a new direction.

FOCUS ON WHAT IS REALLY HAPPENING IN IRAQ

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, democracy dealt terrorism another major blow last week with the defeat of Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, the mastermind behind countless brutal acts of terror.

This was a crucial victory for Iraq's new democracy, and major setback for the terrorists who seek to destroy that democracy.

Mr. Speaker, we all know the sacrifices our military has made to ensure our freedoms and our safety. They fought bravely and served honorably. That is why I cannot understand why some members of the press and some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle put a negative spin on our military's accomplishments.

These folks need to focus on the great progress we are making and stop listening to liberal newspaper editorial columns. Last week's silencing of al Qaeda's top leader in Iraq should silence their false views on the war on terror.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close with a quote by an Army major serving his third tour in Iraq. ''For every vividly portrayed suicide bombing, there are hundreds of thousands of people living quiet, if often uncertain, lives. For every depressing story of unrest and instability, there is an untold story of potential and hope. The impression of Iraq as an unfathomable quagmire is false and dangerously misleading.''

RUBBER–STAMP CONGRESS

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I brought my rubber stamp to the floor today because I want to remind everyone that tomorrow you have got to bring your rubber stamps to endorse the President's proposal in Iraq.

The majority leader's plan is nothing more than let us do more of the same. Now, there is no plan from the White House. What they say, and listen to these words, when the Iraqis stand up we will stand down.

That gives the control to the clerics, from the Shiia and the Sunni. When they stop the civil war, then we can come home. We have put our troops under the control of the Sunni and Shiia clerics in Iraq. That is not supporting the troops.

We have to have a plan about when they come home. We will decide. We say there are 250,000 trained. And there are only 20,000 of those insurgents out there. How many do they have to train before they can handle 20,000 insurgents?

Well, the Iraqi clerics will tell us. Do not forget your rubber stamp tomorrow.

GUN CONTROL MYTHS

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

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Times reported last week that while firearms sales in the United States remained on the rise, gun-related crime and gun accidents are on the decline.

Figures released by the Treasury Department show that retail sales of firearms and ammunition rose by almost 3 percent in 2005. All told, 4.7 million new guns were sold during this past year. Yet government figures and independent statistics revealed that firearm crimes and accidental fatalities, including among youth, all trend downward.

A recent assault on the Mall, ironically involving one of the Capitol Police chief's children who was one of the victims, underscores the importance of making guns available to law-abiding citizens in Washington, DC.

Residents here deserve the same self-defense measures that we do in our individual States. The second amendment applies to all Americans, not just some. It does not take a constitutional scholar to figure that out.

Mr. Speaker, anti-gun activists attacking our second amendment rights are perpetuating a myth of more guns equals more violence. It is not true.

□ 1015

STOP GLOBAL WARMING

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, last week, the President of the Marshall Islands visited Bainbridge Island, Washington. In discussions with me he made a specific plea. He asked America and the U.S. Congress to finally do something about global warming. The reason he said that is that rising sea levels literally could drown his entire nation.

He basically told me that his entire nation could become the first nation state to be environmental refugees, and he said, you know, we don't hardly put any carbon dioxide in the air. You put 25 percent of all the carbon dioxide in the world into the air, and your Congress does nothing. I think he had a pretty good point.

While the science of global warming becomes unambiguous and inarguable and clear, this Congress has lined the pockets of the oil and gas companies with giant subsidies and done absolutely nothing about global warming. It is a tragedy.

You know, we have had a lot of Republicans historically to stand up for the environment, such as Teddy Roosevelt; Bill Ruckelshaus, who met with us yesterday, who said do something about global warming. We need some action instead of passivity.

U.S. FLAG MUST BE PROTECTED

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, it is Flag Day, and I rise in support of the Flag Protection Amendment. February 23, 1945, after surviving the bloodiest battle since Gettysburg, a platoon of marines trudged up Mount Suribachi on Iwo Jima with a simple task, to raise the American flag above the devastation below.

When the flag was raised by SGT Mike Strank and his platoon, history records that a thunderous cheer rose from our troops on land and on sea and in foxholes and on stretchers. By adopting the Flag Protection Amendment, we will raise Old Glory again.

We will raise her above the decisions of a judiciary that were wrong in the law and the history of our values. We will raise her above the cynicism of our time. Out of respect for those who served beneath it and those who died within the sight of it, we must say that there are boundaries necessary to the survival of freedom.

Let us pass the flag amendment and restore to Old Glory the modest protection of the law that she represents.

HOUSE GOP IGNORES THE ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF AMERICA'S MIDDLE CLASS

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

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican Do-Nothing Congress refuses to do anything to address the economic conditions that have led to large majorities of middle class Americans feeling squeezed to make ends meet.

Since taking control of both the White House and the Congress 5 years ago, Republicans have chosen to focus their attention on America's wealthiest, claiming the benefits would trickle down to the middle class. Well, Mr. Speaker, the American people have waited for 5 years, and they have not seen any results.

Instead, they see a monthly paycheck today that is not much different than the one we received back in 2001. While their wages have stagnated a lot of their monthly costs have increased dramatically. Housing costs are at their highest levels in 14 years. Health care costs for the average family have increased more than $1,200. College tuition is up 40 percent and gas prices have doubled. The middle class is indeed squeezed, and yet they are getting no help from the Republican Congress that chooses to listen only to the wealthiest few.

Mr. Speaker, House Democrats are ready to take America in a new direction. We will start by listening to all of our constituents, not just the wealthy elite.

IRAQ AND THE WAR ON TERROR

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank our brave servicemen and women for their exceptional work in fighting the global war on terror.

I recently spent time in Iraq with the 48th Brigade Combat Unit of the Georgia Army National Guard. This unit was doing some incredible humanitarian work for the Iraqi people, building schools and managing health clinics. Of course, these aren't the stories that you read about on the front page of the New York Times, so I want to share one with you today.

One evening during my trip, I was having dinner with a young sergeant named Keith Weathers. This sergeant would explain to me why his unit was doing so much to help the Iraqi people. Sergeant Weathers said it was because he and most Americans have hope and opportunity, and it was his mission to share the abundant opportunities our Nation enjoys with those struggling to achieve freedom in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, our soldiers are bringing hope and opportunity for the Iraqi people every day. The war on terror is not an easy fight, nor is it an expedient fight, but it is undoubtedly the right fight.

I hope we all take Sergeant Weathers's words to heart and continue supporting our troops and their mission.

MINIMUM WAGE AMENDMENT

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Ladies and gentlemen, the American people want a new direction. And Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House Appropriations Committee finally acted on something that the House Republican leadership has refused to address for over a decade.

Finally, yesterday, the full Appropriations Committee passed the amendment to the Labor, Health and Human Services appropriations bill that will very gradually increase the minimum wage from $5.15 an hour to $7.25. Do you know that those who were working at the minimum wage in 1968, if today they were getting a comparable compensation, it would be over $9 an hour.

I commend the Appropriations Committee for passing this in a bipartisan fashion, because expanding economic opportunity for over 7 million hard-working wage earners, plus another approximately 9 million members of their family should not be a partisan issue.

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership has said they do not intend to allow us to vote on the House floor on this critical issue. Today's minimum wage is at its lowest level in 50 years. Let's change that for America's hardest working families.

PRISON FELLOWSHIP

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the Federal activist courts have dealt yet another blow to religious freedom in America. Earlier this month a Federal district court ruled that a faith-based prisoner rehabilitation program in an Iowa prison be shut down. The court ruled that the program sponsored by Prison Fellowship goes too far in blending church and state.

But consider the facts. The program is completely voluntary. The prisoners can opt out of it at any time. It is open to persons of all faiths or no faith, and prisoners are not required to assimilate into any certain faith in order to graduate into the program.

Mr. Speaker, this is sad news for those who wish to see prisoners undergo real change and rehabilitation. This program works. Their recidivism rate is only 8 percent for their graduates compared to about 80 percent for the prison system.

Having worked with Prison Fellowship since its founding 30 years ago, I can personally attest to the tremendous life-changing success it has had in our Nation's prisons for many, many prisoners. This ruling seeks to stop a very successful program of change or renewal. For the sake of our prison population, I hope it is overturned.

THE BUDGET DEFICIT

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I brought this chart along to explain to people what we mean by fiscal responsibility. When Democrats talk fiscal responsibility, we are talking about taking a deficit and turning it into a surplus. Republicans mean take the surplus and create a big deficit.

The 10-year budget, after the Republicans took over, changed a $5.5 trillion surplus to a $5.5 trillion deficit, a swing of $9 trillion. Before you start talking about the war, remember the $300 billion we spent on the war is $.3 trillion. We have had a $9 trillion deterioration. We can do better.

The Democratic Caucus has a better budget. The Congressional Black Caucus has a better budget. The Congressional Black Caucus budget, while the Republican budget is $163 billion in the hole, our budget is balanced.

We did it without increasing taxes on anyone making less than $200,000, and we spent $160 billion more on veterans benefits, education, health care and other priorities. We can obviously do better, and we must do better, because if we don't control the budget today, there will be no Social Security or Medicare in the future.

U.S. COUNTERTERRORISM EFFORTS EXCEL ON THE CENTRAL FRONT OF THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, throughout the past 3 years, U.S. troops have built an elaborate counterterrorism network that has enabled coalition forces to capture or kill hundreds of terrorists in Iraq.

Their skilled persistence and dedication are saving the lives of countless Iraqi citizens and American families. Last Wednesday evening, the safe houses of terrorist Zarqawi became the final destination of two 500-pound bombs dropped by a single F–16C aircraft. Although this tremendous military achievement occurred within moments, it was actually the work of a coordinated counterterrorism operation involving U.S. troops, Iraqi security forces, coalition troops and Iraqi citizens.

In the wake of this historic event, we must continue to support our troops as they work to achieve victory in Iraq. House Republicans are committed to fulfilling this mission to ensure that our troops sharpen their intelligence capabilities on the battlefields of Iraq instead of the streets of America, protecting American families.

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

IRAQ AND NATIONAL SECURITY

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, for months the national media and our friends across the aisle have consistently worked to convince the American people that the battle in Iraq plays no significant role in our national security. I know that some are really sincere in that belief, and I also know that there are some who are only looking for political gain.

But the call to disengage, the call to withdraw, based on this argument that our national security is separate from what happens in the battle in Iraq is naive at best.

On this Flag Day, a day we take to honor this national symbol and remember those who sacrificed for this great Nation, I want every member of the United States military to know that what you are doing in Iraq and in Afghanistan and all across the Middle East is important. It is vital to our national security, and it will ensure that our flag proudly waves for freedom for generations to come.

FLORIDA'S HURRICANE PREPAREDNESS

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, this week tropical storm Alberto marked the first challenge of hurricane season for Florida residents. Florida residents again demonstrated their experience and level of preparedness. My district stood in Alberto's path, but the performance of emergency services and utilities proved exemplary, and the storm's disruption proved minimal.

In fact, a silver lining might even be found. Yesterday's rain extinguished 18 wildfires. I applaud Governor Bush for his strong leadership in ordering an evacuation of low-lying areas and declaring a state of emergency. As we learned in the tragedy of Katrina, the threat of tropical weather must be taken seriously.

While Alberto will certainly not be the greatest challenge we will face this hurricane season, we can be proud of our reaction in our State. Dunnellon Police Chief Bob Jackson, in central Florida, demonstrated the right attitude when he said we cannot control the weather, but we can certainly react in a proactive way.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 5576, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 865 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5576.

□ 1029

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5576) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, with Mr. PETRI (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, June 13, 2006, the amendment by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 252, line 5.

Pursuant to the order of the House of that day, no further amendment to the

bill may be offered except those specified in the previous order of the House of that day, which is at the desk.

1030

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. HEFLEY:

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

SEC. ____. Total appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced by $678,000,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

I rise again today to offer an amendment to cut the level of funding in this appropriations bill by approximately 1 percent. The amount equals approximately $678 million.

While the total spending in this bill is significantly less than last year's bill, and I want to commend the chairman on that, this bill is still over $250 million more than the President requested.

Let me just give you an example. I mean, Amtrak for instance, we are going to put $1 billion, more or less, into Amtrak again in this bill. I do not know when we are going to come to the realization that Amtrak just is not going to work. It is not going to survive with the present way we handle it.

We have to draw the line somewhere, and I feel strongly that the projected deficit for next year is too large. We can do something about the deficit right now. It will not solve it, but at least symbolically it says we are interested in trying to get to that goal.

By voting for my amendment, you are stating for the record that the budget deficit is too large and the American taxpayers should not be burdened in the future because we cannot control our spending today.

I have no doubt that some of the good programs in this bill will take a cut. While that is unfortunate, our budget should be no different from the taxpayers' budget at home. When you have less money, you simply spend less money. It is really that simple.

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

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

With all due respect to the gentleman, and I do respect this gentleman, I believe this is an unnecessary amendment. The Congress cannot and should not abdicate its responsibility to review individual programs and make individual recommendations based on that review. The desire to hold spending in check should be based on congressional oversight of specific programs. We should not take a ''meat axe'' approach nor should we yield our power to the executive branch, and so, therefore, I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

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

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

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. 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 Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCHENRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCHENRY:

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 to demolish or restrict use of the interchange located at Exit 131 of Interstate Route 40 and State Route 16 in Catawba County, North Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

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

My amendment is very simple. I certainly appreciate Chairman KNOLLENBERG and his able staff working with me to craft this amendment and make this possible. I want to commend the chairman for his hard work and dedication each year on this House floor and in committee to pass a strong budget that restrains spending but funds our major priorities. Thank you and your staff.

My amendment is very simple. It prohibits funds from demolishing a current interchange on interstate I–40. This is something requested by local officials and by the North Carolina Department of Transportation. This buys us 1 year.

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

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to accept the gentleman's amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. LIPINSKI

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. LIPINSKI:

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

SEC. . The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for ''Department of Treasury—Departmental Offices—Salaries and Expenses'', by reducing the amount made available for ''Internal Revenue Service—Business Systems Modernization'', and by increasing the amounts made available for the Secretary of Transportation, for carrying out the Rail Line Relocation Projects as authorized by section 9002 of SAFETEA–LU, by $10,000,000, $20,000,000, and $30,000,000, respectively.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to provide $30 million in funding for the Rail and Relocation and Improvement Grant program. With severe budget constraints, I know hard choices had to be made, and I appreciate the leadership of Chairman KNOLLENBERG and Ranking Member OLVER on this bill.

However, as a Member who represents the rail hub of the country in Chicago, I understand the critical need to fund rail improvements to communities across the country. Rail is a vital mode of transportation, providing numerous public benefits, including efficient freight shipment, fuel conservation, pollution reduction, traffic congestion relief and economic development.

Recognizing that we need to invest in our railroads, Congress authorized $350 million for the rail line improvement program in last year's SAFETEA–LU transportation bill. Unfortunately, the administration proposed zero funding. We are asking for $30 million.

This money would be vital in funding projects that will not only help economic development and create jobs but also alleviate adverse effects of rail traffic on our communities. This includes enhancing safety and motor vehicle flow at road crossings and improving the quality of life in surrounding communities, including quiet zones. All types of rail lines across the country will be eligible for this funding.

This amendment has broad bipartisan support, including the gentleman

from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN), who have all joined me as cosponsors of this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to join me in their support.

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

I know the gentleman has an honest appeal here in terms of doing what is best for his district, but here is the problem, and we are running into this problem consistently. We ran into it yesterday. More and more people are looking for a source of money, a piggy bank, if you will, and the IRS seems to be one of those targets.

What I would say is that with this money that he is choosing to take, he would subsidize the relocation of rail for private rail companies. This gentleman's amendment proposes to fund these subsidies by taking critical funding from the Treasury. As I mentioned, we have been hit again and again, and it seems as though they are going after the salaries and expenses side of the budget. Pretty soon, you weaken that organization to a point that they cannot do their job. We need to obviously be able to collect and deposit revenues into the Treasury. That is one of their major roles.

This amendment cuts the Treasury's departmental offices by $10 million. That is salaries, that is people, that is personnel that they need. This would significantly damage U.S. global economic and national security interests and cripple the Treasury's ability to fight the financial war on terror, and some of that money may have come out of that. We do not need to go there. We do not need to malign the money that is being used to fight the war on terror.

This amendment also cuts the IRS' business systems modernization program by $20 million, ''BSM'' as it is commonly called. While it appears to some that this account is $45 million above the President's request, it is actually just a restructuring of the IRS accounts. In fact, BSM is currently funded at the request level, which is already $30 million below last year's level. Cutting this $20 million will force IRS to lay off many of the 317 personnel who are currently working on the BSM project, delaying all work on the modernization of the IRS legacy systems.

So it may seem harmless to take $20 million here and $10 million there, but pretty soon, you rob Peter to put something in Paul's lap. Unfortunately, this leaves us at odds with how we balance the entire bill in the end. We have to have money for this organization, the IRS, and the many areas in which they work. The most recent one added was the involvement in terrorism.

So I would strongly object to the gentleman's amendment on that basis, I understand this is a program that he is very fond of and certainly favorable to, and there are a number of people from Illinois that I believe are on the same side. However, I must object, and I must oppose the amendment. I just wanted to add one other point.

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

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

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

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) for yielding, and I also want to compliment the chairman and the ranking member for crafting a very good bill.

I rise in support of the amendment and to echo Mr. LIPINSKI. I think the money in this amendment would actually allow and provide for rail grants throughout the country. It will provide another needed funding stream for States and municipalities wishing to alleviate traffic and improve air quality through rail transportation, whether in Chicago or my hometown of Staten Island.

We face some of the worst commute times in the Nation. And let me be fair: A primary reason for their transportation problems lies with the fact that we have a Metropolitan Transportation Authority which has neglected our borough for decades. Our sole direct transit link to Manhattan remains the Staten Island Ferry and limited express bus routes. The island is also only served with one passenger rail line on its east shore, the State Island Railway.

This amendment will make much needed funding available to enhance and expand rail projects like many being considered on Staten Island. We have been working to reactivate a passenger rail line along the island's north shore. The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey have projected 11,000 to 15,000 passengers would ride this line daily. This amendment will allow the State or the MTA to apply for money to complete studies needed to get the project off the ground, building on money already in this bill for the same purpose.

Other potential projects this amendment could help advance are a light rail along the island's west shore and improvements on the existing Staten Island Railway.

While we would like to see the grant program funded at higher levels, this amendment would be an excellent start in expressing Congress's commitment to passenger rail, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I rise, too, in support of this amendment that provides $30 million for the Capital Grants Railroad Relocation and Improvement program. Those of us who are in regions who have ports and who have the propensity to move goods, movement across our State and across the Nation, understand the importance of this particular amendment.

□ 1045

I have the elevator corridor. It is 37 percent capacity. We need to expand that because of the freight and the goods movement that is coming in from the ships coming into our ports and across the country. We cannot do that without an infusion of capital to help with the security of that cargo as well as the improvement in the quality of life in our communities.

It has been said that when you have rail lines you can help then to increase the quality of life, reduce emissions in the air, provide the type of air quality that is sorely needed, especially in areas like Los Angeles and Long Beach. So I understand why the gentleman has introduced this amendment, and I am part of the cadre of Members who are asking for this to be approved because it is an investment in rail infrastructure and for economic development reasons. It also enhances the quality and safety of our communities.

And so I thank the chairman for his comments; however, I would suggest to him that this really moves rail more efficiently and more effectively, and I ask for this amendment to be approved.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the ranking member (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, at the outset here I want to say that this is a worthy program. However, the President's request this year for budgeting under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee was at least $3 billion below the enacted levels for the same functions in the previous year's bill, in the 2006 bill.

During every stage of this process, I have pointed out that we had that set of holes, serious holes in the budget that had to be filled, that we needed to try to fill. There is a further problem that under the authorizing legislation there are guarantees for funding for transportation items in highways, in FTA, in FAA, which the President's request was also below. We had to meet those guarantees in order to be able to bring the bill to the floor for debate at all. Otherwise, the point of order would lay against the whole TTHUD bill that we are debating today.

So here we have an amendment which proposes to put money in an item in transportation where there are already heavy guarantees that we have

to meet and proposes to take money from another section of the bill, one section of the bill which is about one-sixth as large in total as the transportation portion, and takes money from that where there are no guarantees whatsoever. This is something which I must oppose.

We cannot have this situation where money is being taken from other parts of this legislation, making them even worse off than they were under the President's request and whatever the chairman and his staff have been able to figure out how, as best they could, to fund the issue, and to take it for other items in transportation. We cannot do this at this time in the process, and I must oppose the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, safe and efficient rail lines are necessary for the continued economic vitality of our Nation, so they require our investment. This amendment would help fund rail projects that would boost economic development, create jobs, increase safety, and improve the quality of life for millions of Americans. That is why this amendment has broad bipartisan support and support from Members across the country.

I urge my colleagues to join us in voting for this amendment. While I appreciate what the chairman and the ranking member have done in crafting this bill, I do urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment to make this needed investment in rail which will help in districts all across the country.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN), who is, by the way, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Rail on the authorizing committee.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, it has been over 2 years since the train bombing in Madrid and almost a year since the rail bombing in London and we still have our heads in the sand in this country. We are waiting until another country tries to take over our ports before we get serious about port security. I pray that it doesn't take a disaster for us to care about rail security.

We spend billions and billions of dollars on aviation and highways, but our rail system repeatedly gets short-changed by this Bush administration and this Congress, even though five times as many people take trains as planes every day and while freight demand is expected to double by 2020.

I was recently in several European countries meeting with their transportation officials about rail security, and I can assure my colleagues that the United States is way behind all other countries in rail infrastructure and investment. Every industrialized country in the world is investing heavily in rail infrastructure because they realize that this is the future of transportation. But, sadly, as this system gets bigger and better, our system gets less and less money.

This amendment, which provides just $30 million in the Rail Line Allocation and Improvement program, is a good start in providing the money that our rail system must have to meet the needs of an ever expanding freight and passenger rail system. It is time that we start investing in improving our rail system in this country, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support the freight and passenger rail by supporting this amendment.

Mr. OLVER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I really want to point out that yesterday we had a huge amendment to add funding to Amtrak, an amendment that involved over $200 million of additional budget outlay for Amtrak. I supported that amendment, and I supported that amendment because in that amendment all of the offsets came out of the transportation area or other areas that were within the authorizing committee's jurisdiction. It was the authorizing committee that offered the amendment, and all of the offsets came out of their jurisdiction.

In this case, this amendment takes money completely outside the authorizing committee's area. We have now heard from the chairwoman, and the ranking member of the authorizing subcommittee for rail, and takes the money out of one of the much smaller segments of this bill. That is why I oppose the amendment, and I will continue to oppose those kinds of amendments which take money out of the smaller areas of this legislation, all of which are equally cut short in a budget which is well below, at least under the President's recommendations, well below the present year's enacted legislation.

So I will oppose those kinds of amendments consistently where they take money out of the smaller areas of the bill to move them to the area of the legislation, namely transportation, which lives under guarantees of minimum funding from the authorizing committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. 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 Illinois will be postponed.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I would like to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to commend him for his hard work on this important legislation. And while I strongly support Chairman KNOLLENBERG's bill, I will be voting in support of its passage, I am disappointed that this bill does not provide funding for the Office of Personnel Management's initiative to modernize the Federal Government's retirement systems.

The current antiquated paper system is in desperate need of modernization. A failure to provide funding to establish a more efficient and effective electronic process for handling these retirement claims, especially after the first three contracts have already been awarded, represents a significant setback for the modernization efforts.

While I understand that funds are tight in the current budget climate, unnecessary delays to the modernization of the Federal Government's retirement processing will only end up costing us more in the future, and it will likely lead to additional unnecessary delays and errors in the processing of retirement benefits under the current antiquated system.

I would urge the gentleman from Michigan to work with the Government Reform Committee, the Office of Personnel Management, and other interested stakeholders to explore in conference ways that funding for this important initiative might be restored and contracts continue on track.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's interest on this and other important issues addressed in the appropriations bill, and I would be happy to work with the chairman, Chairman DAVIS, as this legislation moves on to conference.

As the gentleman noted, funds are tight in the current budget climate, and we were unable to provide funding for all the new initiatives proposed this year. But as a Member of Congress and a Federal employee, I understand the importance of modernizing the Federal Government's retirement systems and look forward to working with Chairman DAVIS as we move forward.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out that since these colloquies, at least when they start over on the other side, remain on the other side, I would just like to point out that this is an issue that I have already indicated my very strong interest in. So I would be very happy to work with my chairman in trying to find the funding to be able to do what the gentleman wants, because it has been a matter of very high priority for me and for our side of the aisle as well.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. DELAURO:

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 to enter into any contract with an incorporated entity where

such entity's sealed bid or competitive proposal shows that such entity is incorporated or chartered in Bermuda, Barbados, the Cayman Islands, Antigua, or Panama.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

□ 1100

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

This amendment would simply continue current law by extending a provision that was accepted in conference last year. It would prevent the Departments and the agencies under this bill from using any funds to contract with American companies which have incorporated in Bermuda, Barbados, the Cayman Islands, Antigua, and Panama to reduce their tax obligation to the United States.

The Homeland Security Department operates under a similar ban. Recent data shows that despite costing our government $5 billion in lost tax revenue, corporate expatriates will reap more than $15 billion in Federal contracts in the coming years. Four of our top 100 Federal contractors have incorporated in tax-haven countries. One of them actually holds a contract with the IRS; the agency charged with collecting taxes is contracting with a company that is determined to avoid paying them.

Sixty-six percent of the companies that hold government contracts but are incorporated in an overseas tax haven pay no Federal taxes whatsoever. These companies have no business being rewarded by getting new business opportunities with the Federal Government.

The GAO has determined that these companies have an advantage when they compete for Federal contracts. It found that the contractors who are corporate expatriates can ''offer a price that wins a contract based more on tax considerations than on factors such as the quality and the cost of producing goods and services.'' In essence, the American people may not be getting the best product possible because of the loophole.

The amendment will not affect existing contracts, just as it did not this year. It simply ensures that in the future we will favor good corporate citizens with contracts instead of companies who put paying American companies at a competitive disadvantage.

Corporate expatriates have made a clear choice to leave this country to lower their taxes. It is up to us to say if they are going to manipulate the loopholes in our Tax Code, then they will no longer be able to reap the benefit of government contracts. In this amendment, we ask them to make a different choice.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

First, let me state that of course I do not condone companies relocating for tax purposes overseas. But I oppose the gentlewoman's amendment because I think it is a bad policy, and I will explain.

From a taxation point of view, this language is not necessary. Congress addressed the issue of corporate inversions in the Jobs Creation Act of 2004. The JOBS Act added a new section to the Tax Code which treats U.S. companies that complete a corporate inversion transaction after March 4, 2003 as domestic U.S. corporations for tax purposes.

Second, Congress addressed the issue of corporate inversions by enacting a contracting ban which is still in effect today. Given these two congressional actions, I don't see the need to further punish the people who work in the U.S. for these affected companies.

Companies registered offshore employ hundreds of thousands of U.S. workers, a fact that I believe is lost in these debates. It is easy for Members to vote for amendments such as these until they realize that constituents in their own districts are employed by these very firms and depend upon these firms for a paycheck.

Additionally, I am opposed to the amendment because the U.S. Government enters into billions of dollars' worth of contracts with private sector companies each year. As a proponent of good government, it is essential that competition for these contracts be allowed to go to the company that is the most effective and the most cost efficient.

Agencies under the jurisdiction of this act that would be affected include numerous safety agencies related to aviation and transportation, and they would not have access to many of the best products available ranging from security software, thermal imaging devices, handsets and engineer and data services for critical infrastructure.

This amendment is not necessary. It makes government contracts less effective by restricting competition, and it hurts U.S. workers. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to Chairman DAVIS from Virginia.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and let's make no mistake: Much of the work that is performed under contracts that would be banned under this amendment are performed in the United States by American citizens, and we are taking these people's jobs and eliminating them. It is an ill-considered amendment.

While targeted tax provisions to address the issue of corporate tax policy is appropriate, penalizing companies by prohibiting them from participating in Federal Government contracting harms both the United States Government and its citizens. The government should be able to purchase the best goods and services of world-class companies wherever they are located, absent compelling national interests. We should be able to get the best bulletproof vests, the best body armor, the best armor for our APCs that are going around, wherever the companies happened to be headquartered. The prohibition makes no sense.

We are also banning companies from doing business for activities that were legal at the time they made these corporate decisions. This is like an ex post facto ban.

Do we want the best technology and premier information technology service, or don't we? That is the question. This amendment is a wonderful way to ensure that we don't.

I can understand if this amendment applied to Iran or Syria or North Korea; but Panama, Bermuda, the Cayman Island, they pose no threat to the United States.

Preventing successful firms from participating in the Federal marketplace just because they happen to be incorporated outside the United States rejects the free market principles underlying our full and open competitive Federal acquisition system. Obtaining full and open competition from all firms who wish to participate in our Federal market is the keystone of our acquisition system, ensuring that taxpayers get the most value for their tax dollar.

Domestic source restrictions like this are simply counterproductive; and, I might add, they invite retaliation. Americans are only 4 percent of the world's consumers. When we start putting bans on countries that we are not going to contract with, they put up similar bans. The end result is instead of our ability to expand marketplaces for American companies and American jobs, we end up restricting it to the 4 percent of the world's consumers that happen to live in the United States.

Also, the substance of this amendment is not necessary because Congress addressed the issue of corporate inversion in the JOBS Act, the Jobs Creation Act of 2004. The JOBS Act added a new section to the Tax Code, section 7874, which treats U.S. companies that complete a corporate inversion transaction after March 4, 2002 as domestic U.S. corporations for tax purposes. So we have addressed this issue. This is penalizing companies who make decisions prior to that time.

Critics could argue that companies that have engaged in corporate inversions prior to March 4, 2002 should be covered by the JOBS Act, but Congress shouldn't ban companies from competing for government contracts because of legal transactions they performed more than 2 years ago, at the same time denying American servicemen and the American Government the

ability to get the best acquisition products that we can for America.

In recent years, the House has consistently rejected contracting ban amendments. I urge a ''no'' vote on the DeLauro amendment.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I rise to support the DeLauro amendment.

It is a sad day in America when someone comes to this House floor to tell us that we have to depend on companies that renounce their American citizenship to save a few tax dollars to get quality products, workmanship, or services.

We had a great debate a few months ago about allowing a foreign company to take over six of our ports. We almost universally agreed that was a bad idea. It doesn't make any difference, and those companies hadn't renounced their U.S. citizenship, they were foreign companies; I didn't think it was a good idea and I don't know anybody else who did, but I am sure there are those who did. At least the President thought it was.

But why would we think it was a good idea to turn over the Federal business, the business of the American people that is paid for by their tax dollars, to companies that say I don't want to pay my fair share; I want to go to Bermuda or Panama or the Cayman Islands and I am going to pull these little slick tricks, and I am basically not going to pay my fair share, but I want all of the benefits of being an American and all of the benefits of being an American company. I want to get those American tax dollars so that my company can profit even more and pay even less of its fair share. That is what this is all about.

I know a really good attorney. He has got a dog named Loophole. That is what this business is about. We have already covered this. It was covered all right, it was covered with a nice big fat loophole that made it possible for companies that have renounced their American citizenship just so they didn't have to pay their fair share and could still come in and rake in the tax dollars in a way that is most unfair to our own companies.

It gives these foreign companies an advantage over U.S. companies. This is just simply not right. You don't have to be all broke out in brilliance to figure this out. It is time that this House acted. We have done it before, and it is time that we do it again. It is time we start giving people that value their American citizenship as good a deal as it is possible to give them. I would urge support of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to advise the ranking minority member of the subcommittee that he cannot yield blocks of time under his request to strike the last word. The gentleman controls the entire 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. I cannot yield any time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman cannot yield blocks of time. The gentleman may yield to others, but not specific amounts of time to be enforced by the Chair.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for the clarification. I apologize for being a little bit off base there.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut the remainder of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman had 2 minutes remaining and the gentlewoman from Connecticut has 3 minutes remaining, so the gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to lay something out very clearly here. First of all, the notion that these are folks who are going to compete equally with other corporations that do not have the same tax advantage has been decried by the GAO, the Government Accountability Office. Let me repeat their commentary.

They found that contractors who go overseas for the ostensible purpose of reducing their tax obligation to the United States, and I quote, ''They can offer a price that wins a contract based more on tax considerations than on factors such as the quality and the cost of producing goods and services.'' They have a tax advantage because they do not pay what they are supposed to pay in taxes in the United States.

In fact, let me be very clear again. This amendment simply continues what current law is. It extends the provision that was accepted in conference last year. These companies have not suffered anything with regard to their bottom line. As a matter of fact, they are making profits hand over fist, and they are taking advantage of the tax loophole. Yes, they make that decision; but the decision is ours as to whether or not we allow them to come back and to compete for Federal contracts.

I do not have a preference for what they chose. Under the law, they can do what they want. But they should not be allowed to pretend to be an American company when it is time to get contracts but then claim to be an offshore company when the tax bill comes.

I also want to point out that this does not jeopardize and does not affect existing contracts, just as it did not this year. This is about the future.

I also want to make a point that the 2004 tax bill did not apply to companies who already have moved offshore. There are more than 25 such companies that currently operate with a tax advantage that their U.S. counterparts do not enjoy. So do not bring up the 2004 tax bill because it is not applicable.

Mr. Chairman, what we want to do is have companies be good corporate citizens. We are asking them to pay their fair share of taxes. That is what this is all about.

If we did more to discourage companies from setting up just post offices overseas to reduce their tax burden, we would have more funding available in this bill for other purposes. The notion that countries are going to retaliate, it is almost laughable. Barbados is going to retaliate against the United States, the Cayman Islands, Antigua, Bermuda? It is truly laughable that that would be a part of this debate.

□ 1115

Again, why do we want to encourage companies to go offshore to set up a post office box and not pay their fair share and their obligation in taxes to the United States?

So, I would just say to my colleagues, we have an opportunity here again, and people voted on this last year. I hope those who voted ''yes'' will continue to do so and that some will have a change of heart, understanding what the nature of this is all about. Let's have people, if they want to go offshore, that is our system. They can do that at the moment. We can take a look at closing tax loopholes at another opportunity. What they can't do is to come back and feed at the Federal trough and not pay their fair share of taxes like everyone else in this country is obligated to do.

Let's keep the loophole closed. Let's not reopen it at a time of record deficits when we can least afford to do it. This is a matter of patriotism and not profit. You want to do something for our friends and our troops overseas, close this loophole. Be a patriot and support this amendment.

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

I yield to my friend, Chairman DAVIS.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Well, I think if you are a patriot on this issue you oppose this amendment. I guess patriotism can be defined in a number of ways.

First of all, the GAO report that was referred to was a GAO report in February of 2004 before Congress passed the Jobs Act that deals with the tax inequities in this particular area. The companies that are at issue pay full taxes on work and contract work that is performed in the United States. Basically, their offshore incorporation refers to how they look at foreign dollars coming through those and how those are viewed under the Tax Code. But the Jobs Act addressed that, and the GAO report was prior to that Jobs Act.

And finally, let me just add that retaliation, Bermuda is a protectorate of the United Kingdom. Panama is a country and an ally, and this is a very slippery slope once we start getting into which countries can do what that propose absolutely no risk to the United States at all. I think it is a bad amendment and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the DeLauro-Berry-Slaughter Amendment. This amendment will prevent new contracts funded under this bill from being awarded to corporations that set up offshore tax havens.

If a corporation is located in the U.S., and conducts most of its business in the U.S., and employs most of its workforce in the U.S., then it should not be allowed to avoid its tax obligations by simply opening a post office box in the Cayman Islands or Bermuda.

Corporate expatriates cost the United States approximately 5 billion dollars a year in tax revenue. Yet they are expected to reap 1 billion dollars annually in federal contracts during each of the next 5 to 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, what kind of message are we sending to Americans that work hard and pay their taxes when corporate expatriates are rewarded for their deliberate and shameless tax evasion with millions of dollars in taxpayer-funded federal contracts?

When we allow corporations to gain an unfair competitive advantage in the Federal marketplace by relocating overseas to skirt tax obligations, what are we telling small business owners who play by the rules?

Corporate expatriates hurt honest U.S. taxpayers by shifting more of the tax burden onto their shoulders.

And they siphon funds from the Federal budget that are desperately needed for essential government services.

To put this in perspective, consider that today we will debate an appropriations bill that slashes funding for affordable housing programs. Last week, we voted on a bill that cut homeland security grants. And just a few weeks ago we approved a budget that guts critical domestic programs, such as education, veterans' health care, public health, environmental protection, and services for families and communities—just to name a few recent acts of this House.

We were told these cuts were necessary—that we just didn't have the money to keep funding these efforts. And yet, at the same time, billions of dollars are being lost to dishonest corporations.

We must stop hard-earned American tax dollars from lining the pockets of companies that exploit tax loopholes.

It is time to send the clear message that if you want to do business with the U.S. Government; you must play by the rules.

This amendment will help guarantee that only responsible companies can benefit from Federal contracts.

It is pro-business . . . it is pro-consumer . . . and it is pro-American.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support the DeLauro-Berry-Slaughter amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

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

Ms. DELAURO. 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 Connecticut will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

Page 252, insert the following after line 5:

SEC. 945. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to amend section 515.566 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to religious activities in Cuba), as in effect on June 14, 2006.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, regardless of where any of us stand on the debate over the broader issue of travel to Cuba, I hope you will agree that there should be an exemption to the restrictions when it comes to travelers who wish to travel for a religious purpose.

In fact, there is a current exemption for religious travelers. The Flake-McGovern-Emerson-Lee amendment would do nothing to weaken or lift restrictions of any kind of travel, religious or otherwise. In fact, my amendment would simply prevent any changes from being made to the exemption as it now exists.

You might wonder, if religious travel is currently permitted by law, why are we proposing this amendment? Well, let me explain.

In 1999, Congress established by law categories of permissible travel, including travel for religious exchanges. But over the past couple of years the Office of Foreign Assets Control, on instruction from the State Department, has published guidelines to accompany these regulations and they have in fact imposed new restrictions on religious travel to Cuba. They have resulted in the denial of travel licenses to many individuals and churches and synagogues, other religions who until recently had longstanding licenses.

This type of regulation runs counter to the spirit of the 1999 law and current administration policy. For example, a woman from Indiana went with her church group to distribute Bibles and participate in religious meetings and events. Soon after her arrival home she was served with a notice of a several thousand dollar fine because she had been to a beach while she was in Cuba. I spoke to this woman. She had been to a beach once to a baptism. This is how ridiculous these restrictions have become.

As a broader example, groups from the Baptist, Methodist, Lutheran, Presbyterian, Episcopal, United Church of Christ and many other faiths have been denied license to travel to Cuba although they have traveled there legally for years. I am afraid we are getting dangerously close to curbing the free exercise of religion in this context and having government impose a religious test. Are you truly religious enough to travel to Cuba? Is this a real religion that you are representing? That is not the business that this government ought to be in.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this is one of various amendments that will be brought forth, I believe, today with regard to the issue of our policy toward the Communist totalitarianism in Cuba. In fact, this amendment was brought up by Mr. FLAKE a year ago, and it was one of the amendments brought up last year. Since it was brought to the floor last year, the pro-democracy movement in Cuba, and I think it is of relevance to point out, had an opportunity, despite the extraordinary difficulties of speaking out with regard to issues of public policy, either in Cuba or anywhere else, the pro-democracy movement had an opportunity to speak with regard to the amendments that were introduced last year in this Congress. I think it is of relevance and I would like to make note of their position.

We have a letter from the leaders of the Assembly to Promote Civil Society. Unbelievably, a year ago they were able to hold a convention for the first time in totalitarian Cuba. Many of their delegates were not allowed to arrive at the convention. They were detained. They were harassed. They were stopped before they left their house. Others were arrested. The assembly elected leaders, something which is extraordinary in a totalitarian state, and those leaders signed a letter which I would like to introduce into the RECORD, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the amendments that were brought forth that were made, that were introduced last year. And I would just like to say that as those leaders, one of the three, by the way, has since been arrested, is Mr. Rene Gomez Manzano, who signed this letter, subsequently was thrown in the gulag where he is today, despite not having been charged but he is there today in the gulag. And they said, as they expressed their opposition to the amendments that were filed last year, including this amendment by Mr. FLAKE, that the adoption of any unilateral measure to completely or partially lift the existing sanctions of the United States could be interpreted by the Cuban regime in Havana, which has given continuous examples of its absolute immovability and of its repressive and anti-democratic vocation as a policy of accommodation. Now, this is the position of the brave pro-democracy movement in Cuba, which I think it is of relevance to listen to. As I say, one of them was thrown in the gulag after making known this position with regard to amendments that were filed last year, including Mr. FLAKE's.

Another point I would like to bring out which I think of is relevance, the Flake amendment, he admits that it is legal to travel for religious purposes to

Cuba. I want to reiterate that. It is legal. One of the existing categories for travel to Cuba is religious travel. The administration does fight fraud and abuse, people who go and say, use even the most sacred of subterfuges, including the religious travel mantle. The administration does fight against abuse, and regulations are in place to make sure that people who are going for religious travel go for religious purposes.

Now, that must be reiterated, the fact that it is legal to travel for religious purposes. The Flake amendment says, no funds could be spent to change the current authorization, regulation that authorizes religious travel. So if a future administration wished to change the regulation, make it stricter, make it easier to travel, the regulations couldn't be changed under Mr. FLAKE's amendment.

So I simply, as I oppose this amendment, reiterate that it is legal. One of the 13 categories of travel, legal travel to Communist Cuba is for religious purposes. The Flake amendment is confusing, contingent, prospective, and thus difficult really to analyze with regard to its possible effects on the future.

But, for me, the most important factor in this debate is that the people who are suffering the repression today and who risk their lives when they make a statement like Rene Gomez Manzano did a year ago in opposition of this amendment, they are clear in their opposition. So I reiterate their position and oppose the Flake amendment.

Havana, June 24, 2005.

Hon. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART,
Hon. MARIO DIAZ-BALART,
Hon. BOB MENENDEZ,
Hon. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN.

DISTINGUISHED COMPATRIOTS: We have recently learned that, at present, the HONORABLE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES of which you are members is considering several proposals—introduced by various Congressmen—seeking to prevent or hinder the implementation of diverse measures related to the embargo decreed by the United States against the totalitarian regime in Havana.

Of course, we respect any decision that sovereign Congress takes on this matter.

However, we do not wish that anyone pretend that such proposals count with the support of the generality of those who within Cuba oppose the ruling system and who fight peacefully for change.

As you know, the signatories of this letter form the Secretariat of the Assembly to Promote Civil Society in Cuba (a group that on May 20 and 21 successfully held in Havana the first congress of Cuban democrats and which is comprised by the majority of the independent entities located in Cuba); and as such we can assure you—and through you the Congress of that great nation—that our coalition does not support the adoption of unilateral measures to completely or partially lift the existing embargo of the United States, which could be interpreted by the Cuban regime in Havana (which has given continuous examples of its absolute immovability, and of its repressive and antidemocratic vocation) as a policy of accommodation.

Respectfully,

FÉLIX ANTONIO BONNE CARCASSÉS.
RENÉ DE JESÚS GOMEZ MANZANO.
MARTHA ROQUE CABELLO.

Mr. FLAKE. Before yielding 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts, let me simply state I have been to Cuba, as have a number of us. We have met with those who have been in prison for their activities and others. There is no one group that represents the pro-democracy movement in Cuba. Many people have encouraged us to do exactly what we are doing.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment.

As an American, I deeply resent any restriction imposed by my government or any other government under freedom of churches and religious organizations to exercise their religion, meet in fellowship with their counterparts in other countries, worship together, collaborate on projects of common interest and celebrate their faith together.

This administration has taken actions contrary to the very soul of what it means to be an American. It has denied U.S. churches and religious organizations that have been meeting with their Cuban counterparts for years, often decades, renewal of their licenses to travel to Cuba. They have imposed arbitrary restrictions and definitions on what it means to be a church, a national religious organization or a religious denomination.

For 5 months a bipartisan group of Members have asked the decision-makers at the State and Treasury Departments to meet with us and U.S. Catholic, Protestant and Jewish religious leaders to discuss these restrictions, but so far they have refused.

Now they are preparing even more restrictions that will discriminate among the many religious organizations on the island and pick and choose who it is okay to break bread with in faith and fellowship. They will take it upon themselves the right to say what constitutes a church and who is a legitimate person of faith. The United States of America does not and must not take such actions against communities of faith. I urge the people to support the Flake amendment.

Mr. FLAKE. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON).

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this commonsense amendment to protect the ability of religious groups to continue their ministries in Cuba. I am aware that opponents of this amendment will claim it is misguided and could result in tying the hands of expanded religious travel to Cuba. But experience tells a different story.

Nothing in our experience of working with the administration on Cuba policy leads to a conclusion that a liberalization of our Cuba travel policy is likely. In fact, experience tells a different story, a story of increased regulations, increased hurdles and increased difficulties in all forms of travel and trade with one of our closest neighbors.

It is a tribute to the work being accomplished by religious groups that the religious travel license has received so much support. However, we, the supporters of the right to conduct nonpolitical religious work, must remain vigilant in protecting the ability of those workers to travel to where they are called.

□ 1130

This amendment will accomplish that goal. Some may call it prospective. Some may call it misguided. Experience would call it necessary.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership and for helping us sort through this very difficult but important issue.

I am a proud cosponsor of this amendment. I want to thank Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. MCGOVERN for putting this forward because this is quite sensible. The majority of the American people understand this policy. It only prohibits funding for the Office of Foreign Assets Control, OFAC, for the purpose of enforcing restrictions on religious travel to Cuba.

For years, licensed religious exchanges with Cuban counterparts existed, upholding our right, mind you, our right to our religious freedom. However, the State Department recently reinterpreted this policy, which makes no sense. Consequently, national churches are severely restricted in carrying on their relationship with Cuban churches.

Not only does this new policy create inefficient, bureaucratic hoops, but I am concerned that the administration also cherry-picks when granting licenses for different religious organizations. Also, OFAC is being forced to push aside what should be its focus on tracking terrorists in order to meddle into internal religious matters.

Last year we led about 105 Members of Congress in asking the administration to resolve that. Since then we have followed up with meetings and phone calls and letters and still have no answer. This is unacceptable. That is why this amendment is so important.

Hindering the ability of religious organizations to forge partnerships with their Cuban counterparts really strikes at the very heart of our religious identity and our constitutionally enshrined freedom.

So I urge all of our colleagues to support this amendment and to stand up for religious freedom and for religious rights.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, let me simply say, if we are afraid that the Baptists, the Methodist, the Lutherans, the Presbyterians, Episcopalians, United Church of Christ, and

other faiths that are going to Cuba are somehow propping up the Cuban regime, then our worries are misplaced. That regime has been there for 47 years, and to deny missionaries and others the opportunity to go there and convert people to the faith and to work is simply wrong.

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ENGEL:

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).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

Once again I am here to offer an amendment to push the Federal agencies to follow the law and purchase alternative fuel vehicles. I hope it will be accepted again as it has been accepted under other appropriations bills.

I believe I am, at the very least, getting the attention from our colleagues. My office has received more calls about my amendment to this bill than any other appropriations bill so far. So let me clear up one concern.

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

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I would be happy to accept your amendment.

Mr. ENGEL. Thank you.

Reclaiming my time, let me just say that this is common sense. We all in a bipartisan fashion would like to see alternative fuels and alternative fuel vehicles on the road.

Once again I am here to offer an amendment to push the federal agencies to follow the law and purchase alternative fuel vehicles. I hope it will be accepted again.

I believe I am at the very least getting the attention of our colleagues. My office received more calls about my amendment to this bill than any other bill.

So let me clear up one concern—this amendment does not affect the purchase of buses or cars or ferries by States and localities or mass transit agencies.

It does seek to have the federal government provide leadership in finally ending our nation's addiction to oil by promoting the purchase of AFVs.

If federal agencies were in compliance with the 1992 Energy Policy Act, last year the federal government would have put more than 25,000 more AFVs on the road.

For the major agencies funded by this bill, DOT and HUD are failing to provide the leadership we need. In FY05 almost 75 percent of its cars were gasoline only. The Department of the Treasury has a sad record of 96 percent of their purchases being gasoline only.

Mr. Chairman, there is no one solution to our addiction to oil. It will take steps and efforts from all levels of government, industry and the public. We know though that small efforts can lead to big changes. The federal government can provide leadership in this effort—in fact we must.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the University of Mississippi in Oxford, Mississippi, for the construction of the William Faulkner Museum.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all of the gentleman's amendments be read.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a series of amendments on earmark limitations to the Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development 2007 appropriation.

While the Appropriations Committee is touting a two-thirds reduction in earmark spending, the sad news is that even with that decrease, the bill still contains more than $930 million in pork-barrel spending. With more than 1,500 earmarks, this bill contains more earmarks than all of the appropriation bills passed in each of the years 1995, 1996, or 1997.

This bill provides for new zoo docks, opera houses, bike paths, hiking trails, and 1,500 other congressional priorities, all paid for at the expense of the taxpayer.

The most disturbing part of this bill is that these earmarks are paid for with ''funny money,'' with fictitious offsets that would have never left the Treasury to begin with. So while you will hear during this debate many times you are not saving money by getting rid of these earmarks, all the Appropriations Committee would have to do is to simply say we are not going to fund earmarks this year. We will take a lower 302(b) allocation or we will apply it elsewhere instead of funding these earmarks. So that argument that you will hear again and again is simply wrong.

We were unable to identify whose earmarks are in this bill many times, who requested them, or how they were chosen, because we were simply given the manager's amendment last Wednesday, I believe, with these 1,500 earmarks. It is very difficult, and you will see with some of these, they are very vague as to what they are actually funding. So I would submit that oversight is tremendously difficult when you do not even know what the earmark is really for.

If it is to fund a facility, a facility could mean a lot of things. We do not even know anything more than that from the manager's amendment. We are left with these limitation amendments as the only means of shining daylight on the process, on these projects and programs and on this spending, and there is plenty to shine in light of this transportation bill. I hope that we will take the time today to actually look at what we are doing.

This first amendment would limit the University of Mississippi in Oxford from spending $1 million on the new William Faulkner Museum. This $1 million is part of nearly $12 million that the State of Mississippi has provided in earmarks in this bill, including nearly $2 million in HUD grant earmarks.

Currently, the University of Mississippi already owns Rowan Oak, which was a family home of the Faulkners for more than 40 years. Currently, Rowan Oak nonstudent visitors pay $5 for the tour. According to the University's Web site, this earmark will go toward building a new wing in the University museums featuring a biographical timeline exhibition dedicated to the author who once wrote ''I don't care much for facts, am not much interested in them . . . ''

I would say that if we are interested in the facts here, we are spending too much money. We are often told there are criteria when these earmarks come before the committee, strict criteria that these earmarks have to pass or they are not funded. I would ask, please, someone explain what criteria we are using to take money from taxpayers in California or Arizona or elsewhere to pay for the William Faulkner Museum in the State of Mississippi. If you can justify this kind of spending, I would submit you can justify just about anything. If you can just identify it on economic development grounds, what cannot be justified on economic development grounds?

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, economic development initiatives, EDI grants, are targeted grants designed to address local economic development needs. As representatives of these communities, it is our responsibility to ensure that these needs when present are addressed.

While I appreciate the gentleman's efforts, I cannot help but feel they would be better directed at real earmark reform, including authorizing bills, not the meaningless attack on an individual project.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, perhaps at the end of that 2 minutes, I might ask the Chair's indulgence for a little more time.

I do appreciate the chairman's opposing the amendment, and I think it is instructive at this point to talk about the congressional spending procedures that we have in place. We receive the President's budget, and the Congress then acts on that budget by the adoption of a resolution. We decide at that point the level of discretionary spending this Congress will spend on a variety of issues. It is at that point, at the point of the budget resolution, that we decide how much we will spend on domestic discretionary dollars. In other words, upon our adoption of the budget, the level of spending in the discretionary category is decided.

Now, we find ourselves today further down the process. We are today at the appropriations stage. The level has already been decided. Our decision today is how we allocate the funds we have already decided to spend through our budget resolution. The funds set aside for this subcommittee will be spent. That decision has already been made. The decision that we are going to make today is the question of where those funds will be spent.

Now, having said that, Mr. Chairman, I welcome the opportunity to explain to my colleagues the nature of this project. And I have often thought, Mr. Chairman, if I ever had the chance to speak to a national audience about Rowan Oak and the William Faulkner Museum, I would take that opportunity. If I ever do get such a chance, I will tell my colleagues what an absolute jewel is located in my district in the form of Rowan Oak and the Faulkner legacy.

Of course, William Faulkner is one of the greatest authors in American history. The recipient of the Nobel Prize for literature, the recipient of two Pulitzer Prizes. William Faulkner is one of the preeminent figures in the history of this Nation, and I have in my congressional district, I am fortunate to say, the home where he not only lived for 32 years, between 1930 and 1962, when he died, but where he wrote so many of America's great treasures, including Sanctuary; As I Lay Dying; Light in August; Absalom, Absalom; A Fable; The Unvanquished; Go Down, Moses; and the Reivers.

Thousands and thousands of tourists come to Rowan Oak and the University of Mississippi each year for the express purpose of seeing the legacy of William Faulkner. Our guests have included Prince Edward of England, numerous Members of this Congress, foreign Parliamentarians, and people from all over the world.

I want to congratulate my friend from Arizona, and he is my friend, for being consistent. If it were up to people like my friend from Arizona, perhaps we would never spend any money at the Federal level on higher education. Perhaps no Federal dollars would ever go to a museum of any type. It is an entirely honorable position to say that no local economic development project should ever be funded. That is an honorable viewpoint. I do not think it is the position of the Members of the House of Representatives, but it is a worthy opinion nonetheless.

I would simply say that at this point the decision has been made to allocate the money to the subcommittee. Our decision today is whether the allocation will be spent on priorities outlined by the elected representatives of the people or whether these funds will go back to an agency where a nameless, faceless, bureaucrat will make the decision about where these funds will be spent.

I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, all I can do in response to that is quote William Faulkner. Anyone who believes that we cannot save money by eliminating earmarks does not care much for the facts and is not much interested in them. The notion that this budget is set and now all we can do is spend up to the top of it belies the fact that last week we could have offered a lesser bill, a smaller bill. Earlier in the process when we established the budget, we could have simply said we are not going to fund this year.

□ 1145

Therefore we are going to save billions and billions of dollars. But, no, we passed a bigger budget and then we come here today and say, darn, I wish we could have saved money; we just cannot, it is too late.

Mr. Chairman, I would submit that people are getting tired of hearing that argument. And we simply cannot continue to spend money this way. So with that, I would urge that we accept this amendment, and at least start, at least send some signal that we are going to be better stewards of the taxpayers' money.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, however well-intentioned it may be. Mr. Chairman, the amendment strikes one item in the Economic Development Initiative under Housing and Urban Development. And I would say that this item is totally consistent with the purpose of the Economic Development Initiative in the first place.

As the gentleman from Mississippi pointed out, William Faulkner is one of our preeminent authors, surely one of the 10 most famous authors of the 20th century here in America. And having William Faulkner's home and museum in honor of him and showing his legacy is certainly an enormous boon to tourism and, more broadly, to tourism generally, but particularly let's say to American authors and English students. People will flock to that place because of the fame of William Faulkner.

And so I would say that Mr. WICKER, the gentleman from Mississippi, knows his district very well and also knows what it is that will have a serious impact on economic impact in his district. And this one is one of those, as so many of them are under this particular initiative, which involves a partnership between the Federal Government, in a relatively small way, very small way in its totality, and the State Government, and local government, and private investment, private donations that will go and have gone to the home and the museum.

I oppose this amendment. I think this is a very, very appropriate expenditure of money.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have made my comments pretty clearly. I oppose the amendment. I believe that Mr. WICKER spoke eloquently. I also think that Mr. OLVER made it pretty clear that this is not the resolution that we would look for on this particular situation.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment. I urge a ''no'' vote.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by Fairfax County, Virginia Park Authority for field improvements in Annandale, Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would bar Fairfax County

from using $50,000 in Federal taxpayer dollars for field improvements in Annandale, Virginia.

When I first saw this earmark, I had trouble understanding why the Federal Government was giving $50,000 to the Fairfax County Park Authority in Virginia for field improvements. Fairfax County is the 11th wealthiest county in the United States. I used to live there. It is a wonderful county. Has a wonderful park system and a big budget.

Why the Federal Government is funding this, I just do not know. The county's 2007 available funds will total around $3.38 billion, total county funds. In 2004, the median household income in Fairfax County was $88,133, double the national average of $44,684.

The Fairfax County Park Authority in Virginia received over $100 million in revenue in 2005, and spent under $70 million. Again, this is the park authority that we are funding here, adding over 30 million in net assets in one year alone.

In 2005, the assets of the Virginia Park Authority exceeded its liabilities by more than $419 million. Along with parks, recreation centers and trails, the Fairfax County Park Authority manages seven golf courses.

How should we explain this earmark to the taxpayers in Arizona or Colorado or New Mexico or anywhere else; or Mississippi, for that matter? My amendment would simply prevent funding for this purpose. In this bill, Virginia is expecting more than $24 million in earmarking, with more than $3 million in HUD grants alone.

This is compared to States like Wyoming and Vermont which receive less than $1 million in total earmark funds in this bill. Why is the Federal Government adding to the wealth of the Fairfax County Park Authority by giving it $50,000 for field improvements? How does this earmark relate to the central purpose of HUD programs, which I thought was to help house people?

Mr. Chairman, I welcome the justification for Federal funds in this case.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia rise to control the time in opposition?

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my friend taking the amendment out of turn. I rise in opposition to the Flake amendment. The $50,000 that Mr. FLAKE is trying to strike would go to the Fairfax County Park Authority to renovate fields in Annandale, Virginia.

Baileys Crossroads, Seven Corners, Culmore in the Mason District, is just inside the Capital Beltway in Northern Virginia. Like many areas, they are experiencing significant problems with gangs. They have a heavy immigrant population, and thousands of low-income, low-cost apartments.

I might add, open space is at a premium in these areas. One way we can make a positive impact on the gang problem is to give the kids something to do, and that is just what we are trying to accomplish with this particular earmark.

The playing fields in question are used by youth athletic leagues that bring kids in, offering them any number of positive experiences as alternatives to joining gangs and keeping them out of trouble. This is a much more urbanized part of Fairfax County. It may be in the aggregate a wealthy county, but I can tell you the people that this impacts are the lowest of the low in terms of their incomes.

But we have apartments in this Seven Corners area where you have two or three families living in two-bedroom apartments. This is a more urbanized part of the county. The county has over a million people.

Open space is at a premium. Just a couple of years ago, a soccer field where immigrants used to play soccer was displaced by an Eckerd Drug Store, depriving them of other fields. And gang activity in the Culmore area has thrived. Northern Virginia is rapidly expanding.

With every passing year, there are fewer and fewer places for young people to engage in constructive outdoor activity. And the kids that this affects do not have cars, they cannot take mass transit, they cannot afford taxicabs. This is an area where they can get to and be able to find some alternative to joining a gang and joining into illegal activity.

With every passing day, there seem to be more and more ways for them to get into trouble. Athletic activity is one of the best alternatives to gang activity.

There is an old saying, ''You can pay me now or you can pay me later.'' This investment, if it just saves one kid from a life of crime and a career in the prison system, will be well worth the dollars in this particular case.

But in my district, our constituents frequently tell me there are pressing needs; can we help out over and above what they might be able to get in the political process? A lot of the people that this helps generally have been powerless at the ballot box, they have been unable to get it through the usual allocation of park authority funds, which tend to go out to wealthier areas.

Under the HUD portion of this bill, that is where this earmark comes from. There are programs that are supposed to be used to fund revitalization programs. That is exactly what this is, in the Annandale, Baileys Crossroads area.

This project is good use of these dollars. This project, I think, will help the young people in our district turn away from the influence of gangs and get them into more constructive activities. More importantly, I think it is an investment in the future. So it is for these reasons in this particular case that I rise to oppose the Flake amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would just reiterate that putting one kid into a gang with the crimes that could be committed and a life in the prison system is worth a lot more than the $50,000 that we have asked for and earmark in this bill that will improve these fields and make them available to a wide array of young people.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, let me simply state again, Fairfax County's available budget funds for 2007 are around $3.38 billion. The Fairfax County Park Authority received over $100 million in revenue in 2005 and spent under $70 million, adding over $30 million in net assets in 1 year alone.

I would submit that it is the county's responsibility to decide what the priorities are, and if they decide that the priorities are not to spend $50,000 where we want to spend it here, then perhaps it ought to be taken up with the county, but not come to the Federal taxpayer again and again and again for these dollars when the local officials have turned them down for whatever reason.

I can go in my own State and say, the city I live in, they will not appropriate money for the Little League field close to my home. I would like there to be funds for that. So, go to the Federal taxpayer. I could do that apparently. It would meet the criteria, but it is wrong. We should not do that.

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the city of Banning, California, for renovations to the city-owned pool.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this earmark limitation amendment would prevent $500,000 from being spent on renovations to the Banning, California, city-owned pool.

This $500,000 is part of nearly $12 million provided to the State of California in HUD earmarks. Now, I live in the Southwest. I know the desert can get awful hot, and there is nothing better than taking a swim. But I do not know why we ought to give the Federal taxpayer a bath every time somebody wants a swimming pool.

That being said, again here, I wonder what criteria we use when these earmarks come forward. If we can say that swimming pools, city-owned swimming pools are eligible for Federal funding, then what is not eligible for Federal funding? Do the criteria mean anything in that regard? Is anything open? Why not earmark the entire bill.

If we accept the premise, which we seem to accept in this House, that we know better than the Federal bureaucrats on how to spend this money, why not earmark the whole thing? I might hear agreement there.

That is what we seem to be doing. We keep going more and more and more. In 1994, I think there were a total of fewer than 2,000 earmarks on all appropriation bills. Last year there were over 10,000. The dollar value keeps increasing.

So we simply have to go the other way. In 2006 the transportation appropriation bill included $250,000 for the city of Banning, California for city pool improvements. Similarly, the 2005 transportation bill included $250,000 for the city of Banning, California for construction and renovation of the city pool.

So this is $500,000 tacked onto $250,000, tacked onto $250,000 for a pool, that to my understanding, has not even been built yet.

□ 1200

They are waiting for more funds to come from the Federal Government apparently before they even build this pool. How does this happen? How does the community pool receive a revenue stream out of the Federal Treasury?

I think this is simply the wrong way to do business. We have got to stop. What better place to stop than right here on this amendment and say we are going to send a signal to the taxpayers that we are going to do business differently?

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, every one of these projects relative to the gentleman's comments, must relate to the eligibility of the CDBG program. Every single one. We don't waive the requirements.

In fact, to show how worthwhile we think these projects are, for the very first time this year the committee is imposing a 40 percent match for each of these projects. We think that each EDI is so meritorious that with just a little bit of CDBG seed money, these organizations and cities will be able to leverage other funds for the same goal. They do, and it does work.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment as well. The gentleman who presents the amendment has expressed in many ways his commitment to reducing Federal spending across the board. There is not any doubt that he and I disagree relative to the way we should go about reducing the Federal budget and impacting the national debt.

For example, just last week we had an extensive debate regarding the supplemental appropriations bill, which was designed to provide vitally needed funds to fight the war on terror in the Middle East and, above and beyond that, to provide critical funding for relief for those people who are impacted by hurricanes in the gulf coast. The gentleman felt that that spending within that package was unacceptable enough to him that he voted against those efforts.

In contrast, when we attempted to weigh and measure carefully those funding requirements, I thought that supplemental did a fabulous job. I voted in favor of it. So we have a different approach relative to how we would impact the Federal budget.

In this instance, we are talking about very, very small pieces of money. The other involves billions of dollars, but they were critical Federal responsibilities. The gentleman in this instance is addressing by way of a couple of amendments a region in California that has faced very, very explosive growth. The communities within the region are made up of people who are largely older, senior citizen. They do not have an industrial base.

There is, in one instance, a very interesting cooperative project between the community involved, the city, a community college and senior citizen organizations to make sure that there is a recreational activity that will not only assist the schools' physical education programs but also supplement the vital economic needs of that community.

The gentleman has suggested that nothing has been done in the appropriations process regarding reducing spending over these recent years. Let me suggest the reality is much different than that. The fiscal year 2007 House Agriculture appropriations bill includes $35 million less in Member projects than last year's bill.

The Military Quality of Life bill reduced Member projects by $40 million compared to last year. The current House Interior appropriations bill reduced Member projects by $89 million.

We have brought about a small revolution in this last year in the appropriations process. Every one of our bills came in under budget and well ahead of time. Working with the other body, we were able to send all of our conference reports to the President's desk for signature without having an omnibus bill at the other end.

The gentleman, paying lip service to reducing the budget in this amendment, reduces spending by something like .0007 percent. The reality is that whatever money might be theoretically saved by his amendment will go back into the pool and bureaucrats will spend the money.

I believe that the President should and has the responsibility to present the House with a budget. We, in turn, have a constitutional responsibility to control spending. You do that by effective oversight of every one of these programs.

Indeed, in this instance the gentleman seems to have much more confidence in bureaucrats downtown than he has in the Members of the House who do their work every day, day in and day out, year in and year out, in our subcommittees.

Indeed, I strongly object to that style which would suggest a Member's preconceived notion is better than the work of the House. I urge, very strongly, to have the Members vote against these proposed amendments that suggests that either one Member or indeed bureaucrats can do the job better than the committee.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments. When the gentleman says that this money will go back into the pool, I hope we are not talking about another swimming pool here.

Let us remind ourselves what we are talking about here. Whether this funding is being spent by a Federal bureaucrat, I would submit that if they are saying that we ought to be spending money to offset the spending of some swimming pool in Gilbert, Arizona in my district, that would be wrong. A Federal bureaucrat, we ought to have oversight and say you shouldn't do that. But that doesn't mean that we ought to do it ourselves. I mean, it is tough for us to make a credible case for oversight of the Federal agencies when we are spending money like this. This is a swimming pool.

The notion that the criteria now has a 40 percent match that we have to get the local folks to kick in money as well, boy, who wouldn't? Who would not offset their budget? What local municipality would not jump at the chance to pay only 80 cents on the dollar or 50 cents on the dollar for a new project that they have, swimming pool or otherwise? Where did this end? Where does this end? It is no better if it is a Federal bureaucrat. But, boy, we look horrible if we say, hey, we spend money better than Federal bureaucrats. We are going to spend it on a swimming pool in Banning, California. Simply wrong.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

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

Mr. FLAKE. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Bakersfield Beltway System, California.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona.

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment violates clause 3 of rule XXI. It reduces obligation authority and associated outlays below the levels provided in Public Law 109–59 in violation of rule XXI, clause 3.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any Member wishing to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair has examined clause 3 of rule XXI, which originally was adopted by the enactment of section 8101(e) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century as an exercise of rulemaking power, which was amended by section 8004 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA–LU) in order to conform the rule to the current law authorizing funds for highway and transit programs. Clause 3, in part, reads as follows:

''It shall not be in order to consider a bill, joint resolution, amendment or conference report, that would cause obligation limitations to be below the level for any fiscal year set forth in section 8003 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users, as adjusted, for the highway category or the mass transit category, as applicable.''

Clause 3 also states:

''For purposes of this clause, any obligation limitation relating to surface transportation projects under section 1602 of the Transportation Equity Act and section 1702 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users shall be assumed to be administered on the basis of sound program management practices that are consistent with past practices of the administering agency permitting States to decide High Priority Project funding authorities within State program allocations.''

The Chair will make certain findings concerning the language of the rule and the provisions of the existing law.

First, clause 3 of rule XXI, identifying a ''floor'' below which a proposition may not ''cause obligation limitations to be,'' points to levels set forth in section 8003 of SAFETEA–LU.

Second, section 8003 of SAFETEA–LU, in setting forth levels of obligation limitations, establishes aggregate, annual amounts.

Third, the assumption in clause 3 of rule XXI that obligation limitations will be administered on the basis of past practice of the administering agency is confined to projects under section 1602 of TEA21 and section 1702 of SAFETEA–LU.

Fourth, the project in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona is designated as a Project of National and Regional Significance in section 1301 of SAFETEA–LU.

Fifth, the funding for projects in section 1301 of SAFETEA–LU are part of the level of obligation limitations for fiscal year 2007 established in section 8003 of SAFETEA–LU.

From that review, and as asserted by this point of order, the Chair finds that the point of order established in clause 3 of rule XXI, together with the accompanying statutory scheme, were designed to insulate certain projects specified in SAFETEA–LU from collateral legislative change. Under that statutory scheme, the amount prescribed for the instant project specified in section 1301 correlates directly to, though it does not account entirely for, the level of obligations set forth in section 8003, and the funding specified for that project may not be redirected elsewhere in the program. Consequently, a measure placing a restriction on that project would have a esponding effect on the level of obligations.

The Chair therefore holds that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona, by prohibiting funds in the pending bill for the specified project, would, in the words of clause 3 of rule XXI, cause an obligation limitation for fiscal year 2007 to be below the level set forth in section 8003 of the act.

The point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for Xerox Area Road Improvements, Monroe County, New York.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I won't speak for long on this. This is an amendment that seeks to limit Monroe County in New York from spending $1 million on Xerox Area Road improvements. This is one of 111 earmarks New York received in this bill worth more than $46 million, the fourth highest total of all States.

These earmarks include more than $1.6 million in transportation earmarks in this appropriations bill.

Xerox is a Fortune 500 Company. It is a $15.7 billion global enterprise and a valued employer to Monroe County, New York. The Xerox area they are speaking of is made up of 47 major buildings, 5.5 million square feet. I simply don't know why the Federal Government, Federal taxpayers, are being asked to essentially pave their driveway.

Monroe County has already offered many incentives to Xerox, including a $500,000 loan for new equipment, $100,000 training grant from Empire State Development and incentives through the County of Monroe Industrial Development Agency.

□ 1215

Let me just say how pernicious this becomes when the Federal Government weighs in on behalf of local governments who are seeking to incentivize private companies to locate their facility there. You are inevitably picking winners and losers.

If Xerox is not going to locate their new facilities or more facilities or more employees in Monroe County, they are going to do it elsewhere, in another part of the country, and it is likely that we may have to fund job training or other in that other area where it is moving from.

At what point do we say this is not our business? The Federal Government's business is not to weigh in and aid one local government at the expense of another. That is essentially what we are doing here.

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

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. To oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The Transportation, Community and System Preservation program is authorized to fund a wide variety of transportation projects that improve the efficiency of the transportation system in the U.S., reduce the impact of transportation on the environment, and other purposes.

The purpose of this project, and soon I will yield to Mr. WALSH, in question is to rehabilitate several roads in Monroe County, New York to bring them up to acceptable standards and improve safety. These are eligible activities for the program, as defined in law.

Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding me time and for including this appropriation in his bill.

Clearly, the Constitution provides the power of the purse to the House, and clearly, as elected representatives of the people of New York or Arizona or Michigan, we need to help establish priorities for the spending. The Founding Fathers put that power in our hands. We need to exercise it wisely.

Our committee, under the leadership of Chairman LEWIS, has done a great deal to reduce Federal spending. In fact, nondefense discretionary spending has led us to today in terms of reducing spending, and so great credit should be given to the chairman and to the Appropriations Committee.

This expenditure is very important to New York State. We are involved in a competition not just with other States but with other countries around the globe, and across the country we have seen great American jobs lost to global competition where other countries and those communities are supporting those business' moves to those places. We have seen it happen with UTC, with General Electric, with Kodak, and certainly here with Xerox.

We are working with local municipalities, the town of Webster, the County of Monroe, the State of New York, to incentivize, to try to retain those jobs in upstate New York.

Now, Xerox is a major player. They are investing tens of millions of dollars in the location to build a new building, to put in new processes. Upwards of $50 million is their investment. What we are doing is providing one-fourth of the public investment: one-fourth Federal, a portion local, a portion county, and a portion State, to make the improvements that will facilitate the construction of this facility and the access and egress for the employee. Is that a lot to ask?

I would ask my colleague and friend from Arizona, whose State has benefited from hundreds of millions, if not billions of dollars, of Federal dollars support, taxpayer support, my constituents in New York that helped to build all the water projects across the West, that enabled people to live in otherwise very inhospitable places. I understand they now have designs on the water from the Great Lakes because they cannot sustain the populations in the desert where they have chosen to live. New York taxpayers and Michigan taxpayers and California taxpayers, New Jersey taxpayers, have helped to subsidize the livelihoods of the farmers of Arizona. We do not begrudge them that. We think it is great.

The Salt Road project, other water projects across the southwest are providing a livelihood, the electricity, the air conditioning for the people that Mr. FLAKE represents here. We have provided those moneys other the years without any fight, without any begrudging of that. It is important.

We need to work together as a Nation to strengthen our industry, to strengthen our quality of life, and I would only ask the gentleman to please consider this process that he has brought before us today. This $1 million will leverage tens of millions of private sector investment, will enable hundreds of people to gain their livelihoods in upstate New York, to compete in the globally competitive world and allow us to maintain our tax base and our quality of life.

We support the quality of life for people of Arizona. We would ask no less from the gentleman for the people of New York.

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

The gentleman mentions that he does not begrudge those in Arizona seeking water subsidies, for example. I do. I hope the gentleman will join me in voting against the extension of the next farm bill, which gives massive subsidies to cotton farmers in Arizona. They should not have those subsidies. They should not have them anywhere.

So I simply think we have got to start somewhere, and when we say we are going to incentivize and we are going to join with local governments in incentivizing businesses to come, again I have to ask the question. I would love some guidance from the chairman of the committee on what would happen if the city of Newark, New Jersey, for example, said we are trying to lure Xerox to come here and we would like you to help. How does the committee make the decision? Do you look at seniority of the Member who is asking? Do you look at something else? What criteria are then used? When does the Federal Government stop weighing in and picking winners and losers?

Again, if they are relocating facilities, they are relocating from somewhere else. How do we jump in and say we are going to do it here and not elsewhere?

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the city of Weirton, West Virginia, for planning and design, construction, renovation, and build out of facilities.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

This amendment would limit the city of Weirton, West Virginia from spending $100,000 on a facility. Now, I am not being deliberately vague here. This is all we know. This is all we know about this earmark. Again, city of Weirton, West Virginia, we are spending $100,000 on a facility. I would ask for guidance from the committee as to what that facility is, or the author of the amendment.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

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

I welcome the opportunity to speak on the floor this afternoon about the needs of work in West Virginia in this particular appropriation. If there is any town in our Nation that is deserving of economic development dollars from this appropriation bill, it is Weirton, West Virginia.

Weirton is a steel town. Growing up around a nearby steel mill started in 1909, the mill and the town grew quickly, and at its peak, the mill employed about 14,000 employees. However, downturns in the steel industry in the late 1970s and early 1980s reduced the number of employees to approximately 7,000; and today, as a result of our Nation's trade policies that are very injurious to basic industry America and, in particular, our steel towns across the Nation, today the number of employees at Weirton Steel hovers around 1,250, down from that 14,000 number several years ago.

The West Virginia congressional delegation, in cooperation with the Independent Steelworkers Union, we fight every day for policies that favor Weirton's hardworking steelworkers and their families.

Well, despite our best efforts, Mr. Chairman, the loss of steel jobs has resulted in some of the highest unemployment rates in my State. Brook County and Hancock County have unemployment rates approaching 7.6 and 8.6 percent.

This grant combats those unemployment rates. As requested by the city of Weirton, these funds, coupled with other funds like CDBG dollars, generally would be used to develop a meaningful regional competitiveness plan. The language in the bill is that the funding is for planning and design, perhaps construction, perhaps renovation, we would hope; but specifically the city wants to use these dollars to evaluate regional economic and business trends and hone in on specific sectors that have the strongest growth potential within Hancock and Brook

County. They are looking for economic diversification as an alternative to the condition that they are experiencing.

For example, as an industrial town, Weirton and the surrounding area have a number of brownfield properties. These properties sit idle, but if properly redeveloped and integrated into a sound economic development effort, strategically planned, they could be home to new businesses and could generate high-paying job opportunities for those unemployed constituents.

Examples of those businesses might be a period in this area that would include clean coal technology industry, medical device manufacturing, but moving from brownfields to a thriving economic sector takes careful planning, which is what this funding provides.

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

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

Again, I would ask again, we do not know, is it a facility? Is it not a facility? I guess it is planning for perhaps a facility, maybe not. Are we simply subsidizing the city of Weirton, West Virginia? Are we in the practice of subsidizing all cities who are having trouble with their budget? Where do we pick and choose?

Again, we are tasked with providing oversight. How do we provide oversight if we do not even know if we are funding a facility or not?

Let me just give a couple of other examples in this bill, ones that I am not highlighting today. Other examples of vague earmarks, $250,000 to the Salvation Army Family Enrichment Center in Anchorage, Alaska, for the construction of a ''blank.'' The sentence was not completed; $250,000 to the city of Marathon, Florida for the construction of a facility. Again, is it a facility? It may or may not be. We do not know. How can we offer oversight in that case?

This is what it says: $400,000 to the South Valley Community Dental in Albuquerque for the construction of a new, again, ''blank.'' The sentence was not completed; $200,000 in transportation funds for Cedar Bluff, Alabama, no further description; $550,000 to Ed Roberts Campus, Berkeley, California. No other description. What is the money for? We have no idea.

We are, in the Congress, tasked with oversight. This is all we are given from the committee; $750,000 to the city of Temple, Texas for the acquisition and renovation of a facility. There is that dreaded ''facility'' again. Keeps popping up. We do not know what kind of facility. Yet we are asked to fund it.

My staff went so far as to send an e-mail to the committee staff requesting help in determining the intended use of appropriated funds in some of the particularly cryptic line items. We did not receive anything back. I can understand that. There was a lot going on this past weekend. There were 1,500 earmarks added Wednesday of last week. It is tough to get around to deciding what they are, but I would submit that if we cannot, we should not bring them to the floor and ask Members to vote on them, just to vote on appropriating money for ''facility'' when it may or may not be a facility.

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

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

I had the impression that the gentleman from Arizona is now switching off the issue that we are talking on and raised a whole bunch of others to try to create some sort of a category. I want to go back to this particular one.

No State in our great country has over the past at least two generations, and probably more than that, suffered greater economic distress and greater job loss than West Virginia. Thousands and thousands of families have migrated to other States, to West Virginia's great loss and to the gain of those other States.

Now, Weirton, West Virginia is one of those places that has been right on the point of the sphere of this economic distress and job loss. As the gentleman from West Virginia pointed out, it has had serious losses of jobs in the steel industry, and its population has declined precipitously. Precipitously.

It is very difficult to bring back distressed communities in situations like that, and it is a hard effort to do the planning and to figure out what are the projects that are the greatest chance of success to bring back jobs.

□ 1230

And there can be no greater purpose, it seems to me under the Economic Development Initiative under HUD, than to provide help in communities exactly like that. This project, because of the breadth of it and the need in the area, meets all the criteria that HUD has set, and it is totally consistent with the purposes of the Economic Development Initiative program under HUD.

So I rise in strong opposition to the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman, however well intentioned it may be. I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment and hope that that will prevail.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) is recognized for such time as he may consume.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) will have to remain on his feet.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding. It was once said that one of the definitions of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and somehow expecting a different result. That is what we are seeing here with these amendments that are being presented, and I would say to any Member who would attempt such tactics that there is a demonstration of a lack of consideration for all of the hard work that has gone into putting these bills together.

Questions have been raised by the author of this amendment about the specificity of where some of the money is going on some of these line items that are being discussed, and therein lies an illustration of the problem that exists here. The grunt work in the trenches that is done day in and day out by Members of the subcommittee, by the good professional staff goes back sometimes many weeks and months. And when these kinds of amendments are brought up, without any knowledge that is even acknowledged by the author of the amendment, it is a frivolous waste of time for Members on both sides of the aisle.

So I would ask any Member who would operate using this tactic to take that into consideration. It is like a football team that takes the field every week with the same team and winds up losing 50–0. And some might say that the team that takes the kick in the tail every week, well, they have good heart because they want to come back again and fight another day. But at some point you have to measure what that person's brain is all about as well and what kind of consideration is shown to those who work hard in the trenches every day for the teams and to those ''fans'' or constituents that are also looking at what we are doing.

So I would ask again that any Member who is using these tactics that it is a great thing to come and present an amendment. Some Members offer amendments on a regular basis that have a true conviction about what they are trying to accomplish, and then they realize that they are not going to accomplish much and they turn around and work on something else.

Wise up, I would say to anyone proposing these kinds of amendments. Again, it is an attempt to do something over and over again and somehow expecting a different result.

I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I think I am the best intentioned multiple-amendment loser in the House these days, I guess. I keep being told I am well intentioned, but these aren't going anywhere.

Let me just say again. As I mentioned last week or a couple of weeks ago, this is the only opportunity we have. This is it. If we are going to offer any oversight, this is it. And when we get amendments that say for a facility, and let me just say that my staff e-mailed the committee last Friday and said, please, can you give us further explanations so that the authors of these amendments can come to the floor and better defend them? Please let us know what this is. We didn't get anything back from the committee. Nothing. That was 4 or 5 days ago.

Now, I understand it is a difficult thing, but maybe the committee ought to think that maybe 1,500 earmarks in

the manager's amendment might give rise to a little suspicion that we can't police this very well; that when we are spending money on swimming pools and facilities that we don't even know whether it is a real facility or not, that we have overstepped our bounds.

I am not going to apologize for standing up and offering 12 amendments, 12 out of 1,500 that we could choose. There is nothing wrong with that. In fact, we ought to be doing it more often. So I would ask for the indulgence of the Members. This process, this is the only opportunity we have. We found out about the amendments last Wednesday. We go to the committee and attempt to look at them. We are told we can only look in the committee at one binder, right there. We can't even take it back to our office to study these amendments. Not until Friday did we get a copy. As soon as we did, we sent an e-mail back saying please give further explanation on these amendments. We heard nothing back.

What else are we to do? I am asking. What else are we to do?

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

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

Mr. FLAKE. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the city of Yucaupa, California, for the design and construction of a multipurpose athletic facility at Crafton Hills College.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to limit the City of Yucaipa, California, and I think it was misspelled in the manager's amendment that this is from, from spending $500,000 on an athletic facility at Crafton Hills College. Funding for a California community college project should be under the jurisdiction of the State, not for Congress.

This $500,000 is part of nearly $12 million provided to the State of California in HUD earmarks, which is part of $87 million in total earmark funds included. This is the highest amount of any State in the bill.

You would expect that. California is a big State. But, still, when we are spending HUD monies on athletic facilities at community colleges, I would submit something is wrong. We should not be doing this.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The gentleman claims this money should remain apparently in the hands of the bureaucrats downtown, and I would ask him what do bureaucrats know about economic development or constituent needs in Arizona or Detroit or Yucaipa, California? The gentleman from Yucaipa, California, has already spoken eloquently on the needs of the constituents in the City of Yucaipa.

I urge a ''no'' vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, again, I do not know what else to say on this one. I think we have spent enough time on it. This is money for an athletic facility, a HUD grant for an athletic facility in Yucaipa, California. Simply, why we are spending money on that I don't know.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

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

Mr. FLAKE. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Agri-Center Interchange, Tulare, California.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would limit the Strand Theater Arts Center from spending $250,000 for conversion of a theater in Plattsburgh, New York, into a performing arts center.

I simply have trouble again understanding why the Federal Government should pay $250,000 to renovate a theater in Plattsburgh, New York. This is not the only frivolous earmark included in the HUD grants in this bill. Others include $100,000 for the Village of Jamestown, Ohio, for building renovations to the Jamestown Opera House.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Chairman, if I may, either the Clerk designated the wrong amendment or the gentleman is on the wrong script.

Mr. FLAKE. I apologize. We will send down the one we intend to do.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment?

Mr. FLAKE. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the new amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Strand Theater Arts Center in Plattsburgh, New York, to convert the Strand Theater into a performing arts center.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Chair and the Members for their indulgence, and I apologize to the Member from New York.

As I mentioned here, this is funding for the Strand Theater Arts Center, $250,000 for the conversion of the theater in Plattsburgh, New York, to a performing arts center. There are other earmarks in the bill of this type: $100,000 for the Village of Jamestown, Ohio, for building renovations to the Jamestown Opera House; $100,000 to the Metropolitan Theatre Foundation in Morgantown, West Virginia, for the construction, renovation, and buildout of facilities; $100,000 to the Houston Zoo in Houston, Texas, for the construction of the Outdoor Life Science Learning Center.

It goes on and on and on and on. Again, you have to say, where do we stop? Where do we say this is not the role of the Federal Government? Where do we say local government knows best.

We say that we know better than Federal officials and bureaucrats over in the Department of Transportation or elsewhere where to spend money, then it stands to reason that those at the local level know a lot better than we do about what to spend money on. Sometimes in these cases these are facilities that they have decided specifically not to fund, yet we are going to go ahead and fund them.

That may or may not be the case in this case. But when we are saying we know best, we are going to decide

where these monies are going, whether or not it is leveraging local funds, we simply can't justify it to the Federal taxpayer.

We need to remind people again and again we have a deficit this year of somewhere between $300 billion and $500 billion, depending on how you count and what you count. We have a Federal debt approaching $8 trillion, and yet we are spending money to renovate theaters in small towns across the country.

Where do we say we have done enough? This ought to be done at the local level or it shouldn't be done at all. But how can we justify using taxpayer money at the Federal level for projects like this?

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH).

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman, and, first of all, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to say that I wish the record to show I am not only willingly here, I am eagerly here in support of this program.

I know one of the legitimate concerns and criticisms about the process of so-called earmarking has been that where funds are being sought too often they are done anonymously. That is not the case here. I am proud to have penned my name to it, and it is also not the case in any project I have ever sought. I believe it is in the taxpayers' interest to have transparency, and I am proud to be associated with this project. It is the right thing to do.

I am also happy to try to help the gentleman answer some of the questions that he asked. I have to be frank, I am more than a little confused by the assertion on these kinds of motions to strike, and this one in particular, that somehow there is no local participation. In fact, the locals have placed over $1 million in a very small community in support of this. There will be more to follow. Also, under EDI, as I understand the process, a 40 percent local match is required.

And I would note as well that this is an authorized program. The gentleman may have a concern about the authorized program, but this has been an effort that has culminated over more than 12 months to try to qualify under the EDI accounts, which were first authorized back in 1974 under section 108 of the Community and Housing Development Act. So authorization is not the issue.

This is a program that has had congressional votes and presidential signatures over the years, and it has evolved into the current form. This project finds itself on the floor today in virtually every other way over the past 5 years that each and every EDI program has come before us.

□ 1245

It does not find itself on the floor at this moment by a process of whim or political leverage or whatever other nefarious means the gentleman lies behind it. It is quite the opposite.

I think it is important to note this project was rejected under the EDI process just a year ago. It could not demonstrate that it met the qualifications, that it met the requirements under that program. And there are a number of them. You have to provide proof of resulting job creation. Your funding is restricted so you can have no personnel expenses. You cannot pay for program operations. You cannot reimburse expenses at any level, including debt service.

For more than the past year local citizens who have worked so hard on this initiative have hired professional consultants, have conducted a menu of analysis and feasibility studies, all of it part of the public record and all of it designed to meet the requirements and the initiatives under the EDI account.

I have to say the folks who have put forward that effort and worked so hard would be very, very surprised to hear the gentleman's concern.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY).

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time, and I rise in opposition to the amendment and in support of the Strand Performing Arts Center, not because it is in my congressional district, because it is not; but because I recognize it as an important part of economic development in the north country, a part of the State of New York that I partially represent.

Let me suggest that I play a little off of my colleague, Mr. MCHUGH's comments and the notion that what I would suggest the gentleman from Arizona do is direct his angst and his efforts toward the authorizing processes, the processes that created the criteria that many of these projects have had to compete within for many of these years. Maybe that is where the reforms and the oversight would be best directed, because by playing by the rules, the people of the north country have an expectation here that they are going to improve their economic climate, a place that is incredibly distressed, that is in the national interest, I believe, to help assist, and that will be able to improve the quality of life.

Things like being able to recruit good doctors to come to work at the Champlain Valley Physician's Hospital, a place that endeavors to develop a cardiological unit that will provide the opportunity for the people of the north country to not have to drive or relocate their families hundreds of miles away. This adds to the quality of life and the recruitment potential.

I also want to make a brief comment about the comments by Mr. WALSH and associate myself with them. New York State is a donor State. We send tens of billions of dollars every year in Federal tax dollars. New York State taxpayers send to the Federal Government more than they receive in return. A $250,000 earmark for the Strand Theater Arts Center which will help with the economic development in a depressed area is a concern for all of the people of New York, and, I believe, all the people of this Nation.

I think this is an appropriate use of Federal dollars. I think if the gentleman is sincere about his efforts to provide the proper oversight, he ought to direct them towards where they ought to be properly directed, and that is where the rules are made up for it.

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

I appreciate this debate. As I have said before, this is the only forum we have to try to exercise a little fiscal discipline over this process.

A few speakers prior mentioned it is the definition of insanity to stand up, do the same thing, and expect you are going to get a different result. I don't know that I will ever get a different result here. I understand this process. I understand log rolling. I understand what this is about. But somebody has to stand up at some time.

I think the definition of insanity is assuming that the taxpayers are buying this, that they believe this is a good use of Federal taxpayer dollars. I think they see it for what it is. I simply think you have to stand up at some point and say enough is enough. That is what we are doing here.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

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

Mr. FLAKE. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TIAHRT

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TIAHRT:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available to the Internal Revenue Service by this Act may be used to develop or provide taxpayers with free individual income tax electronic preparation and filing products or services other than through the Free File program and the Internal Revenue Service's Taxpayer Assistance Centers, Tax Counseling for the Elderly, and the volunteer income tax assistance programs. In addition, no such funds may be used to implement direct interactive online electronic individual income tax preparation or filing services or products, or a return-free system as described in section 2004

of the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is relatively simple. It says that none of the funds in this bill will be made available for an income tax electronic preparation and filing system at the IRS, being prepared by the IRS.

Now this is a stopgap measure for just 1 year until we thoroughly review before the authorizing committee acts upon this. The IRS is attempting to do a return-free tax system where they would write the software and administer the software so people could have their taxes prepared by the IRS.

They first tried to do this in 1998. They announced it during their annual software developers conference. We tried to stop it. Congress was successful. They did not move forward with it.

In 2000, once again, they tried to propose a tax software business inside the IRS. Congress protested and the IRS backed off.

In 2001, they tried a different avenue through the U.S. Postal Service. Again, Congress weighed in and the plans were again dropped.

In 2002, the IRS used its e-government project and EZ tax filing system. Once again the government backed off after Congress intervened.

In 2004 and 2005, they tried through the return-free tax filing system. We intervened and once again they backed down. Last year Chairman KNOLLENBERG, along with myself and the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) had a colloquy clarifying the House's intention to stop the IRS going into the tax preparation business.

The reason why we are opposing this is stated very well by Mr. Alford, president and CEO of the National Black Chamber of Commerce. He believes that the prohibition should be supported. He says, number one, that the current Treasury Secretary, the IRS Commissioner, as well as President Clinton's last IRS Commissioner, are on record of opposing such a plan, and for very good reasons.

I am going to quote Mr. Alford. He said, ''It is extremely difficult to fathom that a government agency whose primary responsibility is tax collection and tax compliance would not be biased against helping the individual taxpayer when it comes to maximizing deductions. The IRS and State tax collectors are under constant pressure from lawmakers to maximize revenue intake.'' He said that they would likely do everything legally possible to minimize deductions on those tax returns if they prepared them.

Following what Mr. Alford said, those that would be impacted most are minorities because they are usually single, one-job, wage-only type taxpayers that use the 1040 EZ form. They would be the ones at greatest risk. It is not the wealthier Americans who spend money to have their taxes prepared by an expert, but it would be more likely that the IRS would minimize the deductions of lower income earners.

Also, Mr. Chairman, it is not really apparent how much this system would cost. The IRS says just to design the system would cost $300 million, and administering, keeping upgrades and maintaining the software is not included in that. And the private sector already has those products. Software is available. I use Tax Cut software to prepare my own taxes.

This is where the government is trying to compete with the private sector. I think it is inefficient. I think that it is difficult for us to believe that they would try to maximize deductions for taxpayers, especially those in lower income levels and those that are minorities.

Number five, lastly, is polling. The Wall Street Journal recently in an on online poll of 3,000 respondents, 70 percent of them said we should oppose the IRS getting into the business of preparing individual tax returns.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that this would be subject to a point of order under clause 5 because of the way our House rules are written.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

This amendment is similar to H.R. 5114, the Tax Return Choice Act, which I'm a sponsor of and which enjoys over 100 bipartisan cosponsors.

This amendment should not be controversial, and I also think it should have the strong support of the Ways & Means Committee.

This amendment simply prevents the IRS from creating its own electronic tax preparation and filing service, or a ''Return-Free'' tax system, without first coming to Congress and the Ways & Means Committee to present and explain their plans in public and receive congressional authorization for their program.

Rather than infringing on the Committee's jurisdiction—as the Chairman has indicated—this amendment protects the Committee's oversight authority. Our income tax system is highly complicated and burdensome for taxpayers and Congress should work to streamline and simplify the tax code. The solution to these problems is not to empower the IRS to assume an intrusive and complicated role as income tax preparer.

This amendment simply ensures that if the IRS seeks to assume such a role, it must do so with the prior authorization of Congress. A Return-Free tax system would represent a tremendous change in our system of tax collection. Under such a system, the IRS would present taxpayers with a bill which they would have to either challenge or pay. I don't believe the IRS should be in the business of preparing tax returns, and I'm convinced that such a system has dangerous and unavoidable conflicts of interest with the IRS taking control of tax preparation, auditing, and enforcement.

For the first time in the history of our income tax system, the principle of voluntary compliance by U.S. taxpayers would be turned on its head and the federal government would be charged with assessing taxes directly. This structure poses serious implications for taxpayers' rights, privacy and security. Some disagree and think the IRS should be in the business of tax preparation. I think it's inappropriate for this system to be implemented without action by Congress. I don't . . . and I think it is essential that Congress establish the rules if there is to be such a system.

There are too many questions and concerns about a Return-Free system to allow it to move forward without the scrutiny and approval of Congress. This amendment makes certain that the appropriate deliberation takes place.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my disappointment that section 206 and this amendment will not be a part of the FY07 Transportation, Treasury and Housing and Urban Development Appropriations bill.

Section 206 and Mr. TIAHRT's amendment would have stopped the IRS from spending taxpayer dollars to develop a return-free tax filing system or a direct online interactive tax filing system or web portal.

Having the IRS prepare our taxes is a little like having fox guard the hen house, isn't it? This is a bad idea from start to finish.

Right now there is no way to prevent the IRS from implementing a return-free tax filing system or a direct online web portal.

A return-free tax filing system would burden small businesses, and raises serious privacy and data security concerns.

Such a system would unfairly target low income taxpayers who would not have the resources to fight a bill from the IRS saying they owe money. They would be forced to accept what the IRS sent them, and that outcome is exactly what governments who want these systems expect. Their overall goal is to squeeze additional revenue from people who already pay their fair share of taxes.

In my home state of California, where they have been unsuccessfully trying to implement such a system, a recent poll showed that 67 percent of Californians say they do not want the government to do their taxes.

The Tiahrt amendment would have prevented all of that, and I am disappointed it will not be a part of this bill.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment not because I believe it is necessary, but because it is under a point of order; but will carry on the battle to make sure that the IRS does not get into the business of competing with the private sector and taking advantage of those in lower income levels.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the ranking member for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I planned to offer an amendment to H.R. 5576 to limit the

use of funds within the act to prevent the contracting out of jobs of the postal police officers.

Based on a security assessment that predates either the anthrax attacks of 2001 or 9/11, the Postal Service is proceeding with an ill-conceived plan to decrease the number of professional law enforcement personnel at a number of postal facilities nationwide. In lieu of offering an amendment, the Chairman of Government Reform has agreed to write a joint letter to the Postmaster General outlining our concerns regarding the contracting out of the postal police officers.

Further, the letter will ask the Postal Service to base its security decisions on more recent assessments and to put on hold any plans for cuts or redeployments until updated threat assessments are complete.

Nearly 900 men and women serve as postal police officers. Postal police are fully trained, uniformed law enforcement personnel who have full arrest authority. They ensure a safe environment at postal facilities located in major metropolitan areas that are considered high risk. They are the first responders on the scene of any crime that occurs at postal facilities.

Since 9/11, the Federal Government has moved aggressively to replace contract security personnel with full-time Federal employees to appropriately address terrorist threats. Seeking to protect America from terrorist threats by keeping in-house highly trained law enforcement personnel is sound policy, especially given that the Postal Service is an attractive target for a terrorist attack and given the recent anthrax attacks it endured.

I feel strongly that contracting out the Postal Service police officers with private sector personnel with the training or arrest authority or ability to carry weapons puts constituents, including postal employees and patrons of postal facilities to move in the opposite direction as the war on terror continues.

In short, I believe that the Postal Service's plan is pennywise and pound foolish. I want to thank the ranking member of the Transportation Subcommittee for yielding me this time. I also want to thank the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform for his time and commitment to keeping the highest level of security at postal facilities and helping to ensure the safety and security of not only all of the postal facilities and its employees but the American public and its mail at large.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

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 to eliminate, consolidate, co-locate, or plan for the consolidation or co-location of a Terminal Radar Approach Control (TRACON).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today with other colleagues to offer an amendment prohibiting the FAA from eliminating, consolidating, colocating or planning to consolidate or colocate any terminal radar control centers which are referred to as TRACONs.

The TRACON system guides planes within a 40-mile radius of the airport on their takeoffs and final approaches.

□ 1300

In an effort to save money, the FAA has embarked on an ambitious consolidation and collocation plan which will significantly limit our air traffic capacities in the future.

The FAA's current consolidation proposal seeks to eliminate 14 of 24 TRACONs in 9 States across the United States. In some instances, entire States will be left without any approach radar system within their borders. In other instances, consolidation runs the risk of placing undue stress on nearby TRACONs already having to deal with larger airspaces and staffing shortfalls.

For example, under the FAA's plan, the TRACON in Boise, Idaho, will be consolidated into a TRACON in Salt Lake City, Utah. This will leave the entire State of Idaho with no TRACON at all, and controllers in Utah will be directing approaching aircraft into Idaho airports, well over 300 miles away.

In Florida, the FAA is planning to consolidate the TRACONs of Miami International, Ft. Lauderdale/Hollywood International, and Palm Beach International airports, all within a Federal high risk urban area, into one TRACON.

Once this plan is implemented, if a terrorist attack or a natural disaster were to strike the Miami TRACON, then all three major international airports would lose their approach radar system. Controllers in Jacksonville, which is more than 350 miles away, would be where they would be controlled.

Finally, the southern California TRACON, the busiest in the country, reported 12 close calls between January and May 31 of this year. This total is up from only seven close calls during the same period last year.

Just imagine if southern California controllers already operating in a high risk urban area and facing staffing shortfalls have to direct their daily workload of more than 6,000 flights and those flights in a nearby region.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a question of whether or not consolidation can logistically be done. It can be done and it is being done. On the contrary, this is a question of what should Congress be willing to risk for consolidation to occur?

The FAA's consolidation of TRACONs runs the grave risk of leaving our air traffic system vulnerable during critical times.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to my colleague from Idaho, Representative OTTER.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. OTTER. In my 1 minute, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a couple of points that were already touched on by Mr. HASTINGS, but are awfully important to the whole idea of the consolidation of TRACON.

First off, the FAA has furnished us with rules on cost savings which are just totally unrealistic.

Number two, in the Boise airport to which Mr. HASTINGS referred we have not only general aviation, commercial aviation and the National Guard control out of the Boise tower, but we also have the National Interagency Fire Center, which attacks the wildfires on BLM and Forest Service ground all over the West.

And finally, I would say this is such a bad idea, but it would be a terrorist dream. To consolidate all of our air traffic control into one center would be a tremendous target for those folks.

And so, with that, Mr. Chairman, once again I thank Mr. HASTINGS for his leadership on this and for the time. And I would like to offer letters from the Governor, from the National Guard Bureau and also from other interested parties for the record.

Mr. Chairman, in support of the amendment offered by Mr. HASTINGS, the FAA has embarked on a plan to collocate TRACON—radar—facilities from airports around the United States.

My colleagues from Idaho and I have had a number of contacts and meeting with FAA on this issue—and still, there are few answers and lots of concerns about the proposed move of the only TRACON located in Idaho—Boise Airport—to collocate facilities at Salt Lake City.

There are lots of reasons I could share about why this move is of concern to my constituents and I: redundancy of TRACON facilities in the vast Intermountain West, dramatic growth in the region, air space flexibility for our biggest airport, which also serves as the home to Idaho's active Air National Guard as well as the National Interagency Fire Center, which serves the whole West.

But there are general concerns that I think speak to why it is important to support the amendment offered by Mr. Hastings:

Poor cost analysis—limited savings: The FAA has only been able to show negligible savings with the proposed collocation. After two meetings and repeated requests for detailed cost information—to include short-term expenses and savings, as well as long-term projected costs, etc.

On April 27, my delegation colleagues and I met with Administrator Blakey, at which time a rudimentary cost savings analysis was provided, claiming only $2.47 million in savings over 25 years—less than $100,000 per year.

More importantly, by the FAA's own admission, this "analysis" does not take into account all personnel costs, such as the need to hire additional controllers due to loss of flexible scheduling, dual training and other efficiencies currently used at the Boise tower, as well as other potential cost increases.

Therefore, the planned move will likely result in greater costs over that 25-year period.

Poor Planning: It appears that the FAA's "alternatives analysis" being conducted on TRACON collocation does not have a long-range plan or vision.

There is no plan on how TRACON facilities will be collocated and/or consolidated around the Northwest—let alone across the country—as they look to maximize use of their new STARS radar system. At least none has been communicated by the FAA when questions have been raised at meetings.

The process, as presented by FAA staff, appears to be based solely on those projects that are currently working on getting funding or those that have funding earmarked and are ready to go to construction.

In the case of Boise Airport, a much needed new air traffic control tower project has been delayed or benched after more than $16 million in earmarks have been worked on over the past 3 years by my Idaho colleagues and me.

This setback will negatively impact the economic development opportunities, security and safety concerns we have expressed to the House and Senate Appropriators in support of funding for this project.

Colleagues, we aren't talking about decreasing the size of government or lowering our costs here. Until FAA can articulate real cost savings and a national strategy for TRACON collocation and consolidation, we ought not go down this path any further. I urge your support for the Hastings/Wexler/Shaw/Foley Amendment.

MILITARY DIVISION,
STATE OF IDAHO,
Boise, ID, January 27, 2006.

Hon. LARRY E. CRAIG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CRAIG: Thank you for all your efforts on behalf of the Idaho National Guard. I know you are aware of a recent Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) proposal to remote the Terminal Radar Approach Control (TRACON) at Boise Air Terminal to Salt Lake International. I would like to voice the Idaho National Guard's strong objection to this proposal.

Aircrews from the Air and Army National Guard operate here on a daily basis and fly thousands of sorties each year. They are experienced at getting into and out of the airport traffic area. Controllers also gain a familiarity with an area and become extremely adept at controlling traffic within that area. The familiarity controllers have of our local area and their knowledge of our local weather phenomena allows them to provide expedited services that will not be feasible with a controller located in Salt Lake. I know of many occasions when their knowledge of the area and its weather patterns has resulted in the safe recovery of our guard airplanes and helicopters as well aircraft from Mountain Home AFB. I am also concerned that this proposed change may restrict our use of the short field approach and landing strip and that its use may be denied when other aircraft are operating on the main runways, significantly limiting our training opportunities. I am doubtful controllers located at Salt Lake will ever gain the familiarity that would allow them to provide the same exceptional service we currently enjoy.

Sir, of utmost concern to me is the margin of safety that will not be possible with a controller in Salt Lake. Whether the separation is between participating traffic and our C–130's operating on the short field, fire fighting aircraft operations or our helicopter operations, we enjoy a relationship with the TRACON that allows us to operate our military aircraft with civilian traffic simultaneously in a safe, expeditious environment. We cannot accept anything less.

Finally, thanks to your great efforts, Boise will complete a new control tower within the next few years. This great addition to the airport combined with the National Guard's efforts to relocate its munitions storage area will allow for a significant growth opportunity at the airport. Attracting major flying operations in the future will depend on the ability of those aircraft to smoothly transition into and out of the airport. To remote the TRACON to Salt Lake will in all likelihood slow down the traffic flow, thus increasing operating costs and making Boise a less attractive location in which to operate.

Thank you for your continued support of the National Guard and the Boise Air Terminal. If I can be of any further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE F. LAFRENZ,
Major General,
Commanding General.

STATE CAPITOL,
Boise, ID, February 1, 2006.

Hon. NORMAN Y. MINETA,
Secretary, Department of Transportation, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY MINETA: I am writing to express my concerns regarding recent efforts by the Federal Aviation Administration to evaluate the consolidation of some Terminal Radar Approach Control (TRACON) facilities. It is my understanding that Boise Airport is one of the facilities under consideration.

The Boise Airport serves a region that continues to experience exponential growth, necessitating expansion of the airport's facilities. Over the past few years, I have been working with Idaho's congressional delegation in the effort to secure federal funds for the construction of a new air traffic control tower at the Boise Airport. So far, Congress has designated roughly $16 million to date for this purpose. The federal request has included a budget for construction of a new control tower complete with an electronics suite, including radar approach control.

While I understand and support efforts to streamline government expense, I find little savings opportunity with the removal of radar approach control from the Boise Airport to Salt Lake City. I question the value of this consolidation when other facilities in the region that handle less air traffic are not under consideration for similar consolidation.

I also have several concerns about safety and service for air traffic at the largest airport in our state. 1 believe that knowledge of the area by the radar controllers is critical to safety. This interest has been expressed by controllers and pilots, both with a vested interest in personal and passenger safety. Additionally, given the unstable weather conditions in the Boise area firsthand updates on local weather conditions are improved by the added ability of a local radar controller to simply look out the window.

Finally, the Boise Airport has National Guard operations co-located at the airport property. These local military operations require a great deal of flexibility that a Salt Lake City approach could not provide. I have a vested interest in maintaining every advantage I can provide to Idaho's Air National Guard. My state has some of the finest guardsmen in our nation and those men and women are serving admirably in the war against terror. I am in disfavor of anything that might affect their ability to train or perform admirably.

If TRACON facilities were to move to Salt Lake City, Idaho would be the only state in the nation without radar approach equipment capability. In addition, consolidation would limit or end the airport's ability to do simultaneous visual approaches, which would effectively make the Boise Airport a one-runway airport and significantly decrease capacity at a time when growth in capacity is imperative.

Given that you are in the process of making a determination on this proposed consolidation, I want to register with you my concerns and urge you to retain radar approach control at the Boise Airport. I appreciate your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

DIRK KEMPTHORNE,
Governor.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. The location of a TRACON has absolutely no effect on controllers' ability to manage aircraft or the capacity or capabilities of any airport. This is because TRACON controllers do not have to have visual contact with aircraft as today's radar technology allows it to see the aircraft.

I understand that the gentleman is concerned about the complexity of the airspace in south Florida and the risk of hurricanes and terrorist attack on south Florida.

The fact is the busiest airspace in America is in New York, Chicago and Atlanta, served by TRACONs located off the airport site that have been consolidated with other facilities.

Although I agree that the airspace in south Florida is complex, the New York airspace, with three major airports located within 10 miles of Manhattan, is far more complex than south Florida. And any one of the three major New York airports serves more traffic than all of the Miami area airports. However, a total of 15 airports in this area receive services from a single TRACON located on Long Island.

Consolidation would not affect continuity of operations during a terrorist attack or during a catastrophic hurricane. There are contingency plans in place to respond to such situations. The backup for the Miami, West Palm Beach facilities is a Miami en route control facility. In fact, the colocation of the West Palm Beach TRACON to Miami actually reduces the risk that a storm could disrupt service. This is because the Miami TRACON is built to withstand a Category 5 hurricane, unlike the West Palm Beach TRACON.

Just a couple of examples of consolidated TRACONs. A single TRACON on Long Island serves 15 airports, including LaGuardia, Newark and JFK and the most complex airspace in America.

The Potomac TRACON serves 10 airports. Five different TRACONs were consolidated in one facility in Warrenton, Virginia. The FAA also operates TRACONs in southern California that include 22 airports and extend from San Diego to LAX, and a northern California TRACON that serves 21 airports.

The fact is we do not have TRACONs at every airport and we don't need them at every airport, not with the technology that we have. We do not need all the TRACONs that exist today.

FAA's only mission is to ensure safety, and there is absolutely no safety issue associated with consolidating these TRACONs.

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

I yield the balance of my time to my friend from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, Chairman KNOLLENBERG has done an excellent job in explaining the situation, and security issues raised by this amendment are in fact bogus. There are no negative security consequences resulting from the TRACON consolidation that is being proposed.

In fact, as chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee, I have a report from GAO which talks specifically about the benefits of a TRACON consolidation.

Let's be frank about this issue. This is an issue that does concern some movement of personnel, and some personnel in FAA will be displaced. But what we are doing is we are modernizing the system. We are actually updating and upgrading the system. We are putting in better communications so that we can have backup systems that we don't have now.

With respect to the TRACONs in south Florida, and I represent south Florida, again we will be consolidating three of these. We will still have Jacksonville as a backup. It is just like Houston did in the case of Hurricane Katrina when they picked up the responsibility for the gulf coast.

So we can have safety, security in times of national emergency. We can also have efficiency with the limited taxpayer dollars, and upgrading this technology will do an even better job in these new consolidated TRACONs.

So they are bogus arguments. I would like to try to accommodate and we will try to accommodate replacing these personnel in the least disruptive fashion to their families and to their careers. But this is, unfortunately, a personnel matter within FAA.

It is time to modernize, upgrade and bring together the best, most efficient, safest system for the traveling public and the flying public through consolidation of these TRACONs.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am intending to speak for a few minutes and then I will yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Florida to finish the remarks that he wishes to make.

Mr. Chairman, and Members, this is a simple limitation of funds amendment. It would prohibit the use of funds in this appropriation bill for the 2007 fiscal year from being used to eliminate, consolidate, collocate or plan for the consolidation or collocation of a Terminal Radar Approach Control, TRACON, all of them all over the country. That sounds like a fairly strong piece of medicine.

On the other hand, we have seen no plan that I know of. There are very few people who know how many TRACONs there are, though I am sure the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) would be able to tell that exactly. If there are benefits, we have not actually seen what those are. I have not seen them, as the ranking member of this subcommittee with jurisdiction, and I am concerned when a Member from a growing State, growing fast, but a spread out State like Idaho comes and says there will be no TRACON there. That doesn't surprise me particularly. There will be some other States that will not have TRACONs, and if there is low air traffic that may be appropriate. But I have seen no plan justifying what is being planned to be done. We have not been told, and I am concerned in particularly in relatively urban areas about consolidation of these, though that may be exactly where they should be done.

So with the limitation that has been proposed, I am going to support the gentleman's amendment at this time, and hope that that might make certain that I am informed by the bureaucracy at FAA of exactly what their plans are by the next time we end up with this kind of effort on their part.

So with that, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank the ranking member for yielding to me. And let me answer quickly what the FAA is weighing in closing some of air traffic control facilities. Reno would go to northern California. Fresno and Bakersfield would go to Las Vegas. Pensacola would go to Meridian, Mississippi—excuse me, Gulfport would go to Meridian and Tallahassee would go to Pensacola. Lincoln would go to Omaha, and Dayton and Columbus would go to Cleveland. Those are just some of the suggestions.

Why I asked for time, Mr. OLVER, is to respond to my good friend from Orlando and central Florida to tell him that I don't think this proposal is bogus at all. I don't think that he can demonstrate to me that Orlando and Jacksonville are ready to handle, either in the event of a natural disaster or a destruction in the nature of the kind of disasters that we prepare for in our homeland, that it would allow, among other things, that it would be a smooth transition. I don't believe that to be the case. Workload is simply added to those facilities where they don't exist today because those centers will be completely gone if the FAA gets its way.

Simply put, during these critical times we should not be limiting our air traffic capacity, and I believe that that is what my amendment remedies. And I certainly didn't bring it here with any thought in mind of it being bogus. All the air traffic controllers that have contacted my office and expressed their concerns, I don't consider them bogus.

□ 1315

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. GOODLATTE). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GORDON

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GORDON:

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

SEC. 945. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used in contravention of the Federal buildings performance and reporting requirements of Executive Order 13123, part 3 of title V of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8251 et seq.), or subtitle A of title I of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (including the amendments made thereby).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

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

It is my understanding that the chairman of the subcommittee as well as our ranking member have agreed to accept this amendment. So I will be very brief.

Our Federal Government wastes about $250 million a year by not enforcing our own regulations on conservation in our buildings. This amendment simply says that within those areas within this jurisdiction of this committee that they will abide by the current laws, no additional laws, and I think we will wind up saving a lot of money for the taxpayers and be a leader.

This amendment forbids funds to be used in contravention of the buildings performance goals and reporting requirements of the buildings performance requirements of two public

laws and one executive order. In doing so, it adds no new statutory or regulatory requirements for Federal agencies. For instance, with historic preservation requirements, or where there are local market conditions, Federal agencies are still authorized to acquire the best available space in support of the agency's mission. Its purpose is to bring attention to the priority the Federal agencies should make of meeting their responsibilities under existing law to significantly reduce energy use in Federal buildings at a time when energy prices are soaring, and to put the executive branch on notice that the Congress expects it to undertake a serious effort in fiscal year 2007 and every year to move aggressively to save energy in Federal buildings. This amendment's requirements can be met by the Office of Management and Budget and the agencies receiving appropriations under this act stepping up to its responsibilities of rigorously carrying out the intent and reporting requirements of section 301 through 303 of Executive Order 13123.

The National Energy Conservation Policy Act as amended, since 1978 has set out a program for making Federal buildings models of energy efficiency. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 updated that act by establishing energy efficiency goals for Federal buildings for fiscal years 2006 through 2015, by establishing a program for metering energy use in Federal buildings, and by upgrading requirements for the procurement of energy efficient products in Federal buildings. The current building performance requirements for Federal buildings we are focusing on are:

Through life-cycle cost-effective energy measures starting in fiscal year 2006, to reduce energy consumption per gross square foot of Federal buildings of the agency by 2 percent per year through 2015;

To design new buildings for all-around sustainability, including energy efficiency, on a life-cycle basis;

To further save energy by procuring Energy Star and FEMP-designated products for use in those buildings;

To reduce greenhouse gas emissions by switching from petroleum to natural gas and renewable energy sources, and by eliminating unnecessary energy use;

To set up metering in Federal buildings that permit energy use to be measured at least hourly; and

To reduce water consumption and associated energy use.

Sections 301 through 303 are the procedures now in place to provide Federal agencies with the funds they need to achieve the building performance requirements and to hold them accountable for achieving their building performance requirements. Section 301 requires that each agency's budget submission to OMB shall specifically request funding necessary to achieve the goals of that order, which essentially are a restatement of the Federal building energy efficiency and water use requirements. Budget submissions are to include the costs associated with Energy Savings Performance Contracts, utility energy-efficiency service contracts, and other contractual platforms for achieving conservation goals, life-cycle cost-effective products, and construction of sustainably designed new buildings, among other energy costs. Section 302 requires each agency to develop an annual implementation plan for meeting its building performance requirements. Section 303 requires annual reports to the President by January 1 of the next fiscal year on agency progress in meeting its goals.

In recent years, funds requested for energy conservation purposes have not kept up with the need, leading inevitably to the many of the goals and requirements not being met despite the fact that on a life-cycle basis, energy efficiency improvements generally save substantial amounts of money. Annual agency reports to the coordinating body, the Federal Energy Management Program, FEMP, and the subsequent FEMP reports to Congress are often several months overdue. Thus budgetary decisions are predicated on data that is at least 1–2 fiscal years behind. Through the inclusion of this amendment in H.R. 5576—Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, the District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2007, Congress is making clear to the Department of Treasury and other agencies that construct or operate buildings using funds provided under this act, that it expects those agencies and OMB to make energy conservation in buildings a priority and to take all reasonable means both to carry out their responsibilities and to meet the reporting requirements as described above.

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

Mr. GORDON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for raising this important issue, and we would be happy to accept his amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MINNESOTA

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to apply the revised cost-effectiveness index rating system established by the Federal Transit Administration (described in its April 29, 2005, ''Dear Colleague'' letter) to the Northstar Corridor Rail project.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise today because I am deeply concerned about a change of policy that took place last May at the Federal Transit Administration.

In an innocuous sounding ''Dear Colleague'' letter, FTA announced that it would change its system of recommending New Starts Projects for Full Funding Grant Agreements. In plain English the impact of this change is that transit projects which were formerly able to qualify now have a higher standard.

For some projects this change was an inconvenience. But for the Northstar Corridor Rail Project, a New Starts Project planned to run through my district in Minnesota as well as through the districts of my colleagues, Mr. RAMSTAD and Mr. SABO, this eleventh hour rule change may be an insurmountable obstacle.

I cannot stress enough how problematic and counterproductive FTA's decision to change the rules was given the progress towards a Full Funding Grant Agreement for Northstar. They have made great progress in recent months. They have already received the 50 percent local match requirement funded by the State. They have agreed in principle with BNSF Railway Company. They have completed their environmental review process. They have completed advanced preliminary engineering and the planned stations, maintenance facilities and track improvements. So we have made great progress, but it is clear that we need to make sure that we can move to the next level.

I am not opposed to the new FTA standards. I am just opposed to its being applied in the eleventh hour. Given the time and the energy that we have put into this, we want to make sure this eleventh hour change does not limit this very positive project from moving forward.

I will not force this issue for a vote here today, as I intend to keep working with the FTA, the Department of Transportation, and my colleagues to fix this issue. But I want to bring this attention to the House while we debate funding for our country's important transportation programs.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. I will gladly yield to my friend from New York on this issue.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman is withdrawing his amendment, and I know this is an important project in the gentleman's district in Minnesota and that the State and the FTA are working to finalize the details on this commuter rail line.

Let me say for the record, we will watch the progress as this bill moves to conference and as the Northstar line moves to full funding status.

I thank the gentleman for withdrawing his amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I look forward to working with my good friend from New York and others on the committee. We both support fiscal responsibility and Federal transportation projects, and I know we agree that common sense must be a hallmark of that process.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, as we are seeing, we have got a lot of business at hand here today and a number of amendments yet to come and the desire to try to move forward and finish our work here. But this is an important bill that really establishes the Federal priorities in transportation, really does that at a time when we are faced with great fiscal constraints and the need to move forward.

So I would ask my colleagues, as they come forward to the floor, to really understand the constraints of time that we have and the constraints of floor action because, as we know, tomorrow we will be debating at length the involvements in Iraq and their importance to the Nation, something that the American people will ask us to provide great clarity for them.

So as we move forward, we have discussed a number of issues, including the issues by my friend from Arizona, Mr. FLAKE, on the earmarking process and its appropriateness and whether the process for oversight is appropriate. I want to point out that the process has been appropriate, but earmarks make up a very small percentage, six-tenths of 1 percent of all of Federal expenditures and that this process here, the American people can rest assured that this Congress is doing its job with great diligence.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. KING of Iowa:

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 for the construction, expansion, renovation, or building of the Los Angeles Gay and Lesbian Center.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this amendment just simply states that there is a construction project in Los Angeles that would not be available for funding out of this bill, and it is about $300,000.

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

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I also accept the amendment.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''yes'' vote on my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

As I was saying earlier, Mr. Chairman, we have a lot of very important legislation to come and Members are encouraged to participate, but at the same time we need to continue to move forward.

A number of difficult issues face us. Some of them will affect our local districts more than they will affect others. And at the same time, we would urge Members to look at the entirety of what the process is and the entirety of the constraints that we have facing us as we move forward in debate on this important Transportation-Treasury bill.

The committee has worked for hours and months. I need to acknowledge the staff for all of their tremendous work at vetting each of these projects and making sure that the projects meet the budget requirements we are under. As Chairman LEWIS pointed out earlier in the day, the Appropriations Committee has done marvelous work in the 2 years under his leadership, done work in which we have been able to bring appropriation bills in under budget, and in incredibly stealth and quick time we were able to pass these pieces of legislation last year and we will do the same this year before the July 4 recess, thus giving us time to move with our colleagues in the Senate in conference to settle the differences that may exist in each of these spending bills. And as we move forward, Members need to understand that there is a great deal of work left ahead of us.

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

Mr. Chairman, because I think that repetition is important, I want to make certain that Members understand what is expected for the rest of the day. My understanding is that the White House event that was scheduled to take place with Members of Congress tonight has been postponed until tomorrow. That means that we had originally not expected that we would be able to finish this bill today. It now appears that we can if we get the cooperation of all of the Members who had intended to offer amendments.

So I would simply urge Members, if they expect to be recognized, to offer their amendments under the unanimous consent agreement. It is important that they get to the floor and actually offer them so that we can get out at a reasonable time tonight and complete action on this bill because tomorrow is expected to be reserved for the Iraqi debate, and I do not think we want to get in the way of that one.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would be honored to yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, during the discussion on these appropriation bills, there have been a number of amendments to strike out issues that were added by the committee rather than requested by the administration. I think that is a good application of the process, and I think that each one of these items should stand on their own merit. But I think that it would be a mistake to believe that this was a procedure that was not acceptable under the Constitution.

For example, I am holding a pocket copy of the Constitution that I carry all the time, and I read it very closely, having worked with appropriations for many, many years. And I find nothing at all in this Constitution that says that Congress can only appropriate that money which has been requested by the executive branch of government. There is nothing at all in here that says that, nothing at all that says that we can only consider requests by the executive branch of the government.

But in Article I, Section 9, there is a very specific provision in the Constitution that says the executive branch of government or any of the agencies of the government cannot spend any money that has not first been appropriated by the Congress of the United States.

So I say again that if there are those who are concerned that the process is being abused, the Constitution is being protected by Members who are offering projects to be included in the appropriations bills. And I say again those who are trying to strike those are certainly within their right to do that, and certainly that is part of the process, and each one of those projects should stand on their own merit. But there is absolutely nothing in the Constitution that prohibits the ability of Members of Congress to suggest what should or should not be included in an appropriations bill.

And I repeat the article that I referred to is Article I, Section 9, and I have referred to that many, many times in the past.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman. And reclaiming my time, I would point out, as we did earlier, that some of the disagreements that exist between those who are concerned with the earmarking process may be better rectified or more rectified in looking at the rules and the standards and the criteria established under the authorizing process for the allocation of all of these funds.

□ 1330

In that instance, we might be able to bring about the kinds of reform that those who advocate against the earmarking process.

I think it is important that the American people understand that as

local representatives, we are the closest representatives that they get to their expenditure of Federal tax dollars. Therefore, every 2 years they have the opportunity to voice their pleasure or displeasure with us as Members of Congress in terms of whether we are handling the public purse strings appropriately or not.

I think it is all healthy for the body. We look forward to future debates on it. But as we move forward, I think that people need to stay focused on the priorities that are being established, the process which is meant to vet that priority and protect the American people.

They can rest assured that that process is being fully exercised through the appropriations process.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. LIPINSKI of Illinois.

Amendment by Ms. DELAURO of Connecticut.

Amendment by Mr. HEFLEY of Colorado.

Amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona regarding Banning, California.

Amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona, regarding Weirton, West Virginia.

Amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona, regarding Crafton Hills College.

Amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona, regarding Strand Theater.

Amendment by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LIPINSKI

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 209, noes 216, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 274]

AYES—209

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Castle
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
Dicks
Dingell
Doyle
Duncan
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Fortenberry
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Harman
Hayes
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
King (NY)
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickering
Pomeroy
Porter
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shimkus
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weller
Wexler
Wicker
Wu
Wynn

NOES—216

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Chabot
Chocola
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doggett
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hunter
Hyde
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
Leach
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCollum (MN)
McCrery
McDermott
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Murphy
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pastor
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stark
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Clyburn
Evans
Ford
Miller (MI)
Reynolds
Rothman
Sessions

□ 1356

Messrs. BILBRAY, CARDOZA, BROWN of South Carolina, BOEHLERT, MCHENRY, Ms. DELAURO, Messrs. STARK, MCDERMOTT, TOM DAVIS of Virginia, GRAVES and Mrs. KELLY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. JACKSON of Illinois, GUTKNECHT, SCOTT of Virginia, BAIRD, WEXLER, POMEROY and MARKEY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. GOODLATTE). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 231, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 275]

AYES—195

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)

Bishop (NY)
Boucher
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Northup
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rohrabacher
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Solis
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Whitfield
Woolsey
Wu

NOES—231

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
English (PA)
Etheridge
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hooley
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lofgren, Zoe
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
Matsui
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez, Loretta
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Sodrel
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Watt
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Clyburn
Evans
Ford
Miller (MI)
Rothman
Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1400

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 87, noes 340, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 276]

AYES—87

Akin
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burton (IN)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cooper
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, M.
Duncan
Feeney
Flake
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gingrey
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Harris
Hart
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
McHenry
Miller (FL)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Norwood
Otter
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shimkus
Stearns
Sullivan
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Young (FL)

NOES—340

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hyde
Inslee
Israel
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Maloney
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary

Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—5

Evans
Ford
Miller (MI)
Rothman
Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1405

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) regarding Banning, California, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 61, noes 365, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 277]

AYES—61

Akin
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Biggert
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bradley (NH)
Burton (IN)
Cannon
Cantor
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cooper
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Feeney
Flake
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gingrey
Gohmert
Green (WI)
Harris
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Inglis (SC)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
Linder
Matheson
Meehan
Musgrave
Neugebauer
Norwood
Otter
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Ramstad
Ryan (WI)
Schakowsky
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tierney
Westmoreland

NOES—365

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Evans
Ford
Hart
Miller (MI)
Rothman
Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1409

Mr. GUTKNECHT and Mr. KIRK changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Ms. HART. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 277 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) concerning Weirton, West Virginia, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 73, noes 353, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 278]

AYES—73

Akin
Barrett (SC)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Biggert
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Burton (IN)
Cannon
Cantor
Chabot
Chocola

Coble
Cooper
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Ehlers
Feeney
Flake
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gillmor
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Harris
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Inglis (SC)
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
Kirk
Kline
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Matheson
McHenry
Miller (FL)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Norwood
Otter
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Ramstad
Ryan (WI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shimkus
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tiberi
Westmoreland

NOES—353

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Hastings (WA)

NOT VOTING—5

Evans
Ford
Miller (MI)
Rothman
Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1415

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) regarding Crafton Hills College on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 58, noes 368, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 279]

AYES—58

Akin
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Bass
Bean
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bradley (NH)
Burton (IN)
Cannon
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cooper
Deal (GA)
Feeney
Flake
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Inglis (SC)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
Kline
Linder
Matheson
Miller (FL)
Musgrave
Neugebauer
Norwood
Otter
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Ramstad
Ryan (WI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tiberi
Westmoreland

NOES—368

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Myrick

Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Evans
Ford
Miller (MI)
Rothman
Sanders
Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1421

Ms. HARRIS and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 61, noes 366, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 280]

AYES—61

Akin
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Biggert
Blackburn
Bradley (NH)
Cannon
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cooper
Deal (GA)
Feeney
Flake
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Harris
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Inglis (SC)
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Matheson
Miller (FL)
Musgrave
Neugebauer
Norwood
Otter
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Ramstad
Ryan (WI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tierney
Westmoreland

NOES—366

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Evans
Larson (CT)
Miller (MI)
Rothman
Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1425

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 261, noes 166, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 281]

AYES—261

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass
Bean
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)

Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chabot
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Foley
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Harman
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Sherman
Shimkus
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Whitfield
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—166

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chocola
Coble
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Dicks
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Ehlers
Emerson
Everett
Feeney
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Granger
Graves
Gutknecht
Hall
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Marchant
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
Mica
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Musgrave
Myrick
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryun (KS)
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Sherwood
Shuster
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Tiahrt
Turner
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—5

Evans
Gutierrez
Miller (MI)
Rothman
Sessions

□ 1431

Messrs. FORBES, GINGREY, and CAMPBELL of California changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. POE and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, 2006, through an inadvertent error during voting on H.R. 5576, the Transportation-Treasury-HUD Appropriations bill, I was recorded incorrectly as voting no. I ask that the permanent record indicate that on rollcall vote No. 281, the Hastings amendment, I should have been recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. GOODLATTE). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of Housing and Urban Development to implement, administer, or enforce the second sentence of section 6c of the Department's Notice PIH 2006–5 (HA), dated January 13, 2006.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and at the conclusion of my remarks I will yield control of the time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. Chairman, this is the antidisplacement amendment. It is a substantive amendment to current law included in the appropriations bill. Under current law when units are destroyed, made no longer fit for occupation, for habitation, which have had a section 8 voucher inhabitant, the section 8 voucher stays on and can be transferred to another unit as a matter of right.

This bill adds two words, purely substantive. It is not a financial issue. It adds the words ''under lease,'' which means a unit which had been occupied by a section 8 tenant, if it becomes occupied and 2 days later is then subject for demolition, that section 8 voucher is lost to that community.

What we have is this. Communities are dealing with the issue of an overconcentration, in some cases, of low-income people. We all pay at least lip service to the notion of at least genuine integration in our society: racial, economic and in other ways. We have programs that try to promote this, and they often mean let's destroy some of the units that have been too densely packed together for lowest income people and spread them out.

What the addition of the words by the Appropriations Committee does, and it didn't go through the authorizing committee, is to say to a community, when you engage in this process of better distributing and better integrating people, you may lose some of your overall capacity to serve people. That is a terrible choice to put to people. You should not tell a community because you do not want such concentration, you will then be able to accommodate fewer low-income people. That is part of our problem.

You know, there was a time, Mr. Chairman, when urban renewal was known in the black community as Negro removal, because what it meant was you tore down the buildings where all the low-income people lived and you built no replacements.

We now have a policy that say yes, tear down some of them, thin them out, reconfigure them, make them more habitable, but don't have that result in an overall loss of those units which are available for low-income people.

The addition of those two words, ''under lease,'' means more than already is the case; because we have not achieved perfection and the achievement is ideal, we will lose some of the units in communities that decide to deconcentrate poverty and race, will have to pay the price to some extent of having fewer section 8 units available

than before. I think that is a very grave error.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

I rise in strong opposition to the language amendment overturning a HUD regulation concerning the number of units that are placed under lease.

The provision would allow the PHA to essentially create more vouchers for the program than the 2 million vouchers that exist currently. Today the program and the cost of the program is based on the number of units under lease.

If public housing or project-based section 8 units are being demolished, the additional vouchers provided are only for the units actually occupied prior to demolition. The department budgets each year for the number of occupied units it expects to convert from public housing units to vouchers.

Units that are not occupied now are not provided a voucher, since the program only provides a subsidy for those families that are currently receiving a subsidy in public housing.

To provide PHAs with the authority to create vouchers where there are no tenants to protect is simply a backdoor way of creating new vouchers for the program. This cost is not budgeted for in this bill and would be significant.

Approximately 38,000 units in public housing and project-based section 8 are assumed to be demolished in 2007. Of this number, 21,000 are occupied and eligible for a voucher. The cost of these tenant protection vouchers would be $149 million. That is provided for in this bill. If vouchers were made available to those 17,000 units not occupied, as well as those already budgeted for, the costs will skyrocket in 2007 by an additional $122 million and increase every year thereafter.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, the explanation of this amendment that we just heard is exactly upside down. Exactly wrong and backwards.

The fact is that our amendment would ensure that the level of housing assistance is maintained at the same level as previously; that it is not automatically reduced when public housing buildings are demolished or sold. It continues the same number of affordable housing units as previously.

Every year we demolish several thousand units. Until January of this year, the policy always was if you demolish 100 units, there are 100 section 8 vouchers issued, so the number of affordable units in the community does not go down.

In January, HUD put out a new regulation which said that we will replace the units under lease with new vouchers so that if 100 units are demolished but 10 of them were not occupied at that moment because people were moving in and out, they would only replace 90 vouchers. In other words, the number of affordable units would go down.

The policy we have always had which this amendment seeks to continue, not to change, is that when you demolish public housing, you maintain the same number of units by issuing the same number of vouchers, not less, not more. Contrary to what the distinguished chairman said, this would not increase the number of vouchers issued, this would maintain it at the same level as we always have had; one-for-one replacement for all of the low-income housing demolished.

The administration seeks to change that policy, first by HUD regulation last January that said we will only replace those actually occupied at that moment. So if 5 percent of the units are under repair or 5 percent of the units have people moving in and out, there is always some churning, we won't replace those. So the number will go down every time we do this. That is pernicious. It means, as the gentleman from Massachusetts said, that if you want to demolish an overconcentrated housing or you want to privatize an existing section 8 building, what will replace it will be fewer units of subsidized housing.

In the bill before us, the distinguished committee violated the rules of the House because they seek to take this policy initiated by HUD by regulation in January and by adding the words ''under lease'' to the bill, they would say in a broader perspective, in a broader universe than covered by the regulation, we would only replace occupied units.

The Rules Committee said points of order against the bill are waived so we could not raise a point of order against legislating on an appropriations bill. An amendment to take out those words would itself be legislating on an appropriation bill, so it's a one-way racket. The committee can get away with it but we can't unlegislate from the floor.

So this amendment is narrower. It, unfortunately, doesn't prevent the committee from doing what it is doing, which changes the number of units we are replacing to a fraction of those being demolished in some of the housing; but for the public housing at least, which the bill doesn't do but the regulation did, where the regulation said from now on we will only replace occupied units, not the total number of units, this amendment says no funds appropriated shall be used to enforce that regulation. That we can do.

So the CBO scores this amendment as costing zero dollars. All it says is we can't use funds to implement that regulation. It doesn't change the amount of money appropriated for section 8 by a nickel.

What it does say is we will not countenance a change by the department so that the previous policy, which we want to maintain, is if you demolish public housing, you demolish 100 units, you have to have 100 units to replace it, so the total amount of low-income housing in the community is not going down.

They want to replace that by saying they will only replace the units occupied at that moment. So the normal churning effect, people moving in, people moving out, would demolish the number of units replaced.

So this amendment would keep the existing system, the system that has existed for the last few decades, one-for-one replacement, and it is scored by CBO as costing nothing. I would urge the House to adopt this amendment.

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kentucky (Mrs. NORTHUP).

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Chairman, I speak against this amendment. You know, I think all of us want the same thing. We want to make sure that affordable housing is available to as many American families as possible.

In 1999 we changed the rules, and we made every community live by a certain number of units, not how far they could stretch those dollars. And our costs exploded. In fact, in the HUD budget the section 8 voucher program went from 33 percent of the HUD budget to over 50 percent of the HUD budget.

□ 1445

Now, if you believe that the Federal Government has unlimited dollars, that wouldn't worry you. But if you believe that we live in a time where we have to measure every dollar and spend it carefully, you begin to ask what we could do better. Let me reiterate. It went from 33 percent of the HUD budget to 51 percent, but it didn't include one additional voucher. Not one additional American family was able to have a voucher based on those increases in costs. And let me say that the dollars were significant, too. We increased the dollars by over 50 percent in the section 8 program, and still not one additional American family was able to be served by a section 8 voucher. The changes that we are making today are going to allow every community to take the dollars that they have and to use them more effectively and more efficiently so that we can begin to use the section 8 which are already an enormous part of our budget to serve more American families in the future. The idea is to help Americans get into the units that their family wants to get into, maybe near where

they work, maybe near where their family is that can help them watch their children, maybe into a private housing unit where the budget just makes up the difference in the voucher, so that they can live where they want and become independent American families based on the section 8, and not just the 9,000 families that we have in Louisville, Kentucky today but hopefully many more in the future due to these reforms.

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

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, spurious statistics don't help us get anywhere. The fact is, yes, section 8 is a higher percentage of the HUD budget because this Congress has cut down other programs. We have cut down CDBG by $500 million. So what does that prove?

And the fact is that all this amendment seeks to do is to say not that more people should get more section 8 vouchers; I wish we could do that, and not that more people should get affordable housing, but simply to maintain our previous policy, that if you are demolishing low income housing you replace it with the same number of units. QED. And if the administration is so incompetent that we are wasting a lot of money because we are not administering the program properly, there is money slipping through its fingers because they are not administering the section 8 program properly, let them clean up their act. But the fact is the number of units should remain the same or go up.

This amendment says, and the gentlewoman says we are all in agreement, that as many people as possible should be helped. Well, if as many people as possible should be helped, at least let's agree, and this amendment is the only way to do that, not to cut down the number of section 8 units, not to cut down the number of units available whenever we demolish existing housing. That is all this amendment does. Nothing else. And anybody who says that this amendment increases the availability of housing above the policy of one for one is not telling the truth.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I understand that you must have a speaker that wishes to speak at this moment?

Mr. NADLER. No. The other cosponsor had to go back to the committee.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, let me just say that one thing I don't quite understand about what is taking place here, but I want to get to the bottom of it. Having to provide a subsidy for empty units, and that is what you are doing, with a budget that only assumes least unit cost or least unit risks being unable to assist real families, this will, I think, unfairly, shift section 8 dollars to certain regions of the country for what are now vacant units. And this would be to the detriment of the distribution of those funds.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I must correct the gentleman. That is not what it does at all. There are always, in any housing stock, there are always some vacant units because someone moves out on Monday, it takes a month to prepare the apartment for someone else to move in. It has always been the policy that you replace the number of units that you are tearing down. If you are tearing down 1,000 units, you get 1,000 section 8 vouchers. If you change the policy, such as HUD is now seeking to do, such as the bill is seeking to do and which this amendment opposes doing, then you are saying that if 10 percent are vacant because someone has moved out and someone else hasn't moved in yet, they are cleaning it up, that you replace 90 percent instead of the 100 percent.

All this says is continue the policy we have always had of replacing units, not units occupied, because units occupied is always 80, 90 percent of total units because there are always people moving in and out. Someone died last week and so forth. There is no housing stock on earth 100 percent occupied 100 percent of the time. And if you look at 5 percent or 10 percent that are unoccupied now because three people died and five people moved and no one has moved in again, you are reducing the number of units. And all we are saying is don't do that. If you tear down low income housing, replace it one for one on the basis of the number of units. That has always been our policy. That has always been the law and all this amendment seeks to do is to keep it that way and not change it as the bill would do.

I yield back.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, at the end of the day, this creates an entitlement for vacant units. These funds are for tenant protection, not unit protection.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBERSTAR

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBERSTAR:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of Transportation to finalize or implement the policy proposed in the notice of proposed rulemaking published in the Federal Register on November 7, 2005 (70 Fed. Reg. 67389), or the supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking published in the Federal Register on May 5, 2006 (71 Fed. Reg. 26425), in Docket No. OST–2003–15759.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006 the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

For 65 years, aviation trade has been governed by a fundamental principle and a statute which requires that only an airline that qualifies as a citizen of the United States may provide service between citizens in the U.S. or on international routes. The international trade bureaucrats at the Departments of Transportation and State have decided to change that law by rule. That should not be changed by the bureaucrats. It should be done by act of Congress. We ought to have more than just a couple of hours of hearings. We ought to have in-depth hearings in the House and the Senate and decide whether or not we are going to change that statute to something else.

Secondly, why would we, in the context of an international trade negotiation, trade away the one sector of economics where the United States has a positive balance of trade? Aviation. We have a $9 billion surplus balance of payments with the European Community. If we allow U.S. airlines to be sold to foreign interests, that positive balance of payments will disappear. Gone.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. PETRI). The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, let me try to clarify a few things. First, there are no safety or security impacts associated with the proposed rule on foreign investment. In fact, this rule does not change the statutory requirements that limit foreign investment in the U.S. airlines.

For example, U.S. airlines will still be U.S. airlines. U.S. citizens must be in actual control of the airline. U.S. citizens must own 75 percent of the voting stock. U.S. citizens must comprise two-thirds of board membership.

The proposed rule explicitly walls off any foreign investment proposal that would affect safety, security or defense in any way, including any impact of the Civil Reserve Air Fleet, or CRAF program. No foreign investors will have a say when it comes to safety, security or national defense.

In addition, any control afforded to a foreign investor, such as marketing or product quality, can be revoked at any time.

Further, in response to concerns raised within the last several months,

DOT met with General Schwartz, Commander of USTRANSCOM and Robert Jamison, Deputy Administrator of TSA, to double check, I should say to triple check that these agencies have absolutely no safety or security concerns regarding the proposed rule. They did not. The rule itself will strengthen the airline industry in the U.S. The industry will be able to attract additional capital to improve their financial position. Some have indicated that the rule will result in fewer jobs. This makes no sense at all. Strong U.S. airlines result in a stronger aviation community that is ready, willing and able to hire more people, more pilots, more flight attendants, more mechanics.

Further, any open skies agreement between the U.S. and the European Union is predicated on this more modern investment rule. The rule, coupled with a U.S.-EU open skies agreement, will preserve and create new U.S. jobs and expand markets. It will increase the number of international flights operated by U.S. carriers and increase the number of foreign travelers to the U.S. It will also increase service to small and medium cities. This is because international markets must be supported by the robust feed traffic from the non-hub markets.

I am for a strong competitive industry that creates new American jobs, ensures better service, and is a boon for the economy, all without weakening security.

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LoBIONDO).

Mr. LoBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, for over 60 years we have required U.S. citizens to be in control of operation of our airlines. Make no mistake, the DOT's proposed rule will absolutely reverse this critical policy, allowing operation of our airlines to be controlled by competing and potentially unfriendly foreign interests will undermine our homeland security and result in a loss of U.S. jobs.

Mr. Chairman, no critical U.S. infrastructure should ever be under foreign control. Did we not learn anything from the Dubai ports debacle? Doesn't anyone remember the outrage that you shared over Dubai? This is just as big an outrage. The DOT is using executive fiat to implement a very dangerous and absolutely wrong policy. This amendment will ensure Congress determines what is in the best interest of this country, not the bureaucrats of DOT. Remember the explanation we got from the administration on the Dubai ports, that everyone had thoroughly examined it. And then we found out that it hadn't been thoroughly examined. Critical infrastructure must remain in U.S. operational control.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I now yield the remaining time in my allotment to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues, I want to be polite, but let me just say that this is a terrible amendment. It is short-sighted. It is special interest legislation. It is a red herring to prevent, quite frankly, the implementation of an agreement between the United States and the European Union to have open skies.

Now, Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues, if you want to increase jobs in your district, on both sides of the Atlantic, this is not the amendment to vote for. If you want to increase service and have some shot at some international service to your district or your region, you vote for this amendment and you are killing those chances.

The great opportunities for job and expansion of aviation markets in an industry that has been so hard hit from September 11 is expanding these markets, and for the first time we can open those doors and that opportunity. This is all a red herring about investment, trying to tie this to Dubai.

The current limitation of 25 percent foreign ownership continues. It has not changed at all. In fact, we have a guarantee under this that matters of safety and security are off the table to foreign investors.

You know, I am thinking about this. If we use this mentality, Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues, if we used this mentality in the past we would still be trading beads with the Indians. We wouldn't be taking advantage of opening jobs and markets and expanding opportunities for the people in this country.

Simply stated, also, this is a voluntary process in this investment. So this is a protectionist amendment. It benefits a few people to keep things a little cozy the way they are now. And I know people are trying to do that. But it is an enormous step back for the United States aviation industry.

□ 1500

So I urge you to defeat this amendment, which will do great harm to, again, opening doors and opportunities in American, European, and actually all of our aviation opportunities for the future.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), ranking member of the Aviation Subcommittee.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Oberstar amendment.

This amendment would stop the Department of Transportation from implementing its proposed rule to open up U.S. air carriers to a greater share of control by foreign owners. For the past 65 years, we have required that U.S. citizens have actual control over all management decisions of U.S. airlines. In a matter of a few months, the Bush administration has sought to make enormous changes by allowing significant opportunities for foreign investors at the expense of America's safety, security, and its workplace.

The proposed rule would change and allow foreign investors to have a greater say on airline economic decisions that would include being able to direct airlines to buy foreign aircraft or have more repair stations overseas; have work performed by foreign citizens; and dictate routes, frequency, pricing, classes of service, advertising, and code sharing.

I am opposed to the change because it will result in the loss of American jobs, hurt rural and small communities, and could severely jeopardize our safety and security. I am very concerned about the outsourcing of jobs for our pilots, flight attendants, and mechanics, and I urge all Members to support the Oberstar amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

With great respect for Chairman MICA and Chairman KNOLLENBERG, I support this amendment strongly.

This is a matter of priorities, and it is a matter of American ownership in a system that supported and that transported 93 percent of our military personnel to the warfighting theaters. It is a matter of priorities.

Dan McKinnon, Ronald Reagan's head of the Civil Aeronautics Board, who owned and sold North American Airlines and controlled it, said, ''As a rescue helicopter pilot with 61 saves, my number one priority would always be American security. If the country needed me, that's where I would send my planes.''

That is the kind of control, operational control, we need on American airlines. I strongly support this amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding.

Likewise, I have great respect for Chairman MICA, but in this particular situation, this is a national security issue, and you cannot separate national security and security of an airline industry with daily operating procedure. We cannot allow some foreign airline to control the operating procedure of American airline companies, especially in time of war. In time of war, American airlines have always been able to mobilize the American fleet during Iraqi I and Iraqi II; 5,872 missions were flown by American airline companies. Ninety-eight percent of those were my American pilots. If our airline industry is controlled by a foreign country, what makes us think that country will cooperate with us in time of war?

This is certainly a national security issue, and we should not outsource our

national security to the European Union.

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

In my remaining time, I just want to refute what the distinguished gentleman from Florida said, that domestic aviation will not be affected. It will be affected. Foreign owners will decide routes, fleet size, type of aircraft, service in domestic markets and international markets. We will lose an international trade aviation sector.

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

I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is Dubai Ports all over again. Vociferous people are aware of this change in policy, and they will not say what their position is on it. This will undermine national security.

Any country with an open skies agreement will be able to buy and control a U.S. airline for all practical intents and purposes, including Indonesia. Imagine when we deploy our military on the civilian reserve air fleet flown by Indonesian pilots. Oh, there is a little terrorism problem in Indonesia, isn't there? That will be really good. I think they will feel really secure on those planes.

It is also in pursuit of lame free trade agreements, so-called ''open skies,'' yet another loser for America. The outsourcing of pilot jobs, flight attendant jobs, mechanics jobs, and other executive jobs. And I am not so concerned about the execs.

But we are essentially ceding control of the United States of America in violation of statutory provisions if we do not stop the Bush administration.

This must be adopted. Mr. MICA could not be more wrong. This will undermine security and air service in this country.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of Mr. OBERSTAR's amendment.

It appears to me that we should see that we are in a huge deficit with the guarantees being foreign governments. We have lost jobs. We are selling companies and property to persons from out of this country. Now we are going to sell our airlines. I think that is one of the worst decisions we could make for homeland security. And I rise in strong support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Oberstar-LoBiondo Amendment to H.R. 5576.

The Bush Administration's most recent proposal to alter policy regarding the role of foreign ownership of U.S. airlines is an issue that, without question, warrants the full attention and oversight of this body.

Yet, despite the expressed consent of Congress in 2003 regarding the ''actual control'' of U.S. carriers by U.S. citizens, the Administration seems intent on circumventing the will of this body in an effort to fast track an international air service agreement.

While I wholeheartedly support the notion of our aviation industry being afforded every opportunity to excel in the global economy, I do not support the Administration's utter disregard of this body—particularly the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

The Congress should be afforded the opportunity to perform the necessary due diligence, conduct hearings, and debate any proposed changes to foreign ownership laws.

Any modification to laws governing foreign control of domestic carriers will have enormous implications for industry stakeholders and jobs here at home.

As a result, such changes should not be hastily promulgated through a proposed rulemaking introduced in the dead of night.

To characterize DOT's current rulemaking proposal as an artful maneuver would be an understatement.

DOT asserts that in order for the U.S. air transportation industry to remain a leader in the global economy, a reinterpretation of ''actual control'' is needed to ensure access to capital afforded by global financial markets.

Under DOT's proposed rule, foreign investors would be allowed to exercise decisions over all commercial aspects of domestic carrier operations.

U.S. citizens would be required to control only decisions related to safety, security, organizational documents, and the Civil Reserve Air Fleet.

To think that commercial aspects have no implication on security, safety, and the CRAF program underscores the shortsightedness of this proposal.

I support the halting of DOT from issuing any final rule on ''actual control'' and urge my colleagues to vote yes on this commonsense amendment.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding to me.

I rise in support of the bipartisan LoBiondo-Poe-Oberstar amendment on foreign ownership.

The bottom line on this issue is that the DOT's rulemaking runs very close to violating the law that Congress set down for the airline industry. The statue says that U.S. airlines must be controlled by U.S. citizens. The DOT rule would allow foreign investors to own 49 percent, but the foreign investors would be allowed to effectively control the operations. Unfortunately, I do not see how it is possible to separate safety and military airlifts. If foreign owners can control scheduling, staffing, and maintenance, then U.S. owners are not in control of the safety or the military obligations. The proposed rule does not make sense and the DOT should not give foreign control over U.S. airlines just because the European Community is asking for it. Airlines are not just another business. They are an essential form of transportation with many impacts on public policy.

Foreign investment in airlines is a major decision for Congress, not the Department of Transportation. Therefore, we should support the LoBiondo-Poe-Oberstar amendment and reject the DOT rule.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bipartisan amendment, and it is bipartisan, Members on both sides of the aisle.

Congress has rejected, two times already, attempts to change foreign ownership and control requirements. Let us get it right this time. The Congress spoke in unison about the Dubai Ports deal, and they are speaking in unison today to stop this insanity of giving away our assets and having them controlled by foreign investors.

This is not to stop foreign investment. We must have a robust debate. This is a radical change. Altering the foreign control requirement for U.S. airlines does not belong in rulemaking, and that is what you are trying to do today. Being a member of both the Transportation and Homeland Security Committees gives me a unique perspective on the vital role the U.S. airline industry plays in the homeland security and the national defense of our Nation.

I am concerned that the proposed rule is unclear and does not guarantee that heads of security and safety would have complete autonomy from their foreign national leadership. It is no secret that security costs are one of the financial challenges facing our domestic industry. In fact, many additional security measures have been voluntarily undertaken by U.S. carriers.

I hope that both sides of the aisle support what I believe is a very reasonable amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Oberstar-LoBiondo-Poe Amendment prohibit to the use of funds in this bill to implement a proposed Transportation Department regulation that makes a profound change to federal aviation policy.

I would submit that it is actually a radical change. Altering the foreign control requirement for U.S. airlines does not belong in a rule m aking. We need robust debate—when we didn't have debate you saw what happen the Dubii Ports deal.

In their attempt to complete an Open Skies agreement, the administration has sought to avoid an open debate in the halls of Congress.

Congress has twice rejected attempts to change foreign ownership and control requirements. This time should be no different.

The proposed change is heavy-handed, too vague and leaves too many legitimate questions and concerns unanswered.

Being a member of both the Transportation and Homeland Security Committees gives me a unique perspective on the vital role the U.S. airline industry plays in the homeland security and national defense of our Nation.

For these reasons, unlike most other industries, airlines do not easily lend themselves to foreign control.

I am concerned that the proposed rule is unclear and does not guarantee that heads of security and safety would have complete autonomy from their foreign national leadership.

It is no secret that security costs are one of the financial challenges facing our domestic industry.

In fact, many additional security measures have been voluntarily undertaken by U.S. carriers.

But under foreign control, commercial interests may carry more weight when it comes to cutting costs.

Measured foreign investment may be beneficial for U.S. air carriers.

However, throwing open the floodgates to foreign control is not the answer.

At the very least, Congress should have a vigorous, robust debate on this highly sensitive matter before anything is finalized.

I am confident that most members, upon judicious review, will conclude that this proposed rule change, as it stands, is not in the best interest of our nation.

And I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to cover a couple of points. This protectionist amendment is an enormous step backward for the U.S. airline industry. It denies U.S. airlines the ability to compete with the European carriers on a level playing field. It stops the Department of Transportation from modernizing rules governing investment in U.S. airlines.

The DOT rule does not relax congressionally set limits on foreign investment in the U.S. airlines. U.S. citizens must still control, as I mentioned, 75 percent of U.S. airlines voting stock and comprise 66 percent of their board of directors.

The DOT rule safeguards U.S. airline security and safety. It strictly prohibits any foreign influence over security, safety, or the civil reserve air fleet, or CRAF, program.

The DOT rule will create new U.S. jobs and improve service to small- and medium-sized communities. Further delay and opposition to the DOT rule is a blatant attempt to kill U.S./EU. open skies. Eight months is enough time for review.

At this point I would like to yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) for any comments he might wish to make.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and let me say we are not giving away any assets. This has nothing to do with Dubai. This proposed rule does not change any statute with respect to U.S. control or foreign ownership of U.S. airlines. It now is in the law 25 percent maximum ownership. It is going to be the law after this rule passes. What part of 25 percent do these folks not understand? U.S. carriers can accept foreign investment today, up to 25 percent.

They are arguing that safety and security might be put into question. Under the current provisions, there is no enumeration of safety or security spelled out. This, for the first time, spells out safety and security.

Under the proposed rule, the U.S. carrier has the ability to agree or disagree with the terms put forth by the investor. This is just a clarification of an investor's ability to participate in the investment. Simply stated, the DOT's rule is voluntary; it is not mandatory.

Finally, we have worked closely with the Department of Defense to make certain that any of our defense interests are preserved. So this does benefit the consumer. We will have lower international airfares. It creates jobs, and it will create them throughout the country. It also increases the service to airports and locales that currently do not have the opportunity for international service on both sides of the aisle.

Now, let us face it, a small group of people do have a very vested interest in not changing this. They have got a little corner on the market. They do not want to see this changed. So I have said this is a red herring. I tried to be polite.

I urge defeat of this amendment.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, very briefly, this rule just came in today, and I think everybody is aware of this. The administration understands that an amendment may be offered today to prohibit the use of funds to implement a final rule regarding the foreign investment in U.S. airlines. The proposed rule would facilitate a landmark agreement with the EU that would provide significant benefits to consumers as well as the domestic passenger and cargo airline industry. The administration has worked with Congress to address these concerns with the final rule and recently extended the final comment period by an additional 60 days. The administration, as you must know, strongly opposes any amendment that would prevent the Department of Transportation from finalizing its rule.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

□ 1515

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding. I rise to strongly, strongly oppose the Oberstar-LoBiondo-Poe amendment, because just exactly as the chairman and others have spoken in opposition to this amendment, this would jeopardize the open skies agreement between the United States and the EU.

The domestic airline industry in this country is struggling with fuel costs. This would literally be a knockout blow to them. In regard to the rulemaking, it assures still that 75 percent of stockholders must be Americans on a domestic airline, and two-thirds of the seats on the boards of directors must be United States citizens.

I think we need to move forward with this rulemaking so that we can complete this open skies agreement with the EU. This is a benefit to our airline industry that we have an opportunity to open up the markets to more international flights, more flights of their carriers into our smaller non-hub cities.

Mr. Chairman, this is a jobs bill. I strongly, strongly voice my opposition to this amendment. I ask my colleagues to vote against it.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of Mr. OBERSTAR's amendment to prevent implementation of a proposed Department of Transportation rule that would in effect reverse 60 years of precedent on United States policy in the domestic airline industry. Permitting the Department of Transportation to implement a rule that would weaken longstanding policies on domestic ownership of U.S. airlines would permit the reversal of policy that is in place specifically to ensure U.S. control of an industry that, in many ways, is of vital strategic importance to our Nation. As some of my colleagues have noted, domestic airlines fly 92 percent of our troops and 41 percent of our cargo to battlefields in the War on Terror. I believe that allowing the daily operations of our airlines to be controlled by competing and potentially unfriendly foreign interests could undermine U.S. homeland security and national defense. Having an industry that plays such a key role in times of national need be placed outside the hands of U.S. ownership could introduce a degree of unpredictability that our Nation could not afford in such crucial times.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to note that under the current rules, rules that have served the U.S. airline industry very well, that have served U.S. employees in that industry very well, that have served our Nation's traveling public very well and that have served our Nation's security very well, our Nation has successfully established Open Skies agreements with over 75 countries in the last 15 years. Current rules do not inhibit international travel or create untenable positions for trade with foreign countries. Current rules work.

I join Mr. OBERSTAR in opposing changes to those rules, changes that could very well jeopardize U.S. national security. I believe this is unwise and I support the Oberstar amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. 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 Minnesota will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORAN OF KANSAS

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORAN of Kansas:

Page 252, insert the following after line 5:

SEC. 945. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to administer, implement, or enforce the amendment made to section 515.533 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, that was published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2005.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the

gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is a bit of history that brings me back to the House floor, an issue related to agriculture, food and medicine trade with Cuba. In July of 2000, this House of Representatives adopted an amendment that I offered to allow the sale of food, medicine, and agriculture commodities to the country of Cuba.

That amendment was adopted in July of 2000 by a vote of 301–116. A majority of Republicans, a majority of Democrats supported that amendment. As a result of that amendment being adopted, in the conference committee significant discussion occurred, and ultimately the new legislation, TSREEA, the Trade Sanction Export Enhancement Act, of 2000 was adopted.

And that law was working reasonably well for a period of time. And then in February of 2005 the Department of Treasury adopted a regulation changing some of the rules related to trade with Cuba. Mr. Chairman, we have had the opportunity now of taking advantage of the opportunity to sell for cash, cash up front, to Cuba agriculture commodities, food and medicine, to the tune of about $400 million in the previous year.

But the regulation that the Department of Treasury adopted in February of 2005, began to seriously limit the opportunity for American farmers to export their agriculture commodities to Cuba. The rule that the Department of Treasury promulgated changes the time frame in which the cash must be paid. Again, let me reiterate what we are talking about here is not whether Cuba must pay cash in advance, but the timing of that payment.

And the rule that was adopted by the Department of Treasury changed that time by a few days. It turns out to be 10 days to 2 weeks. And the issue becomes that the cash must be paid prior to the shipment from the United States as compared to prior to delivery in the port in Havana.

As a result of that, it has increased the cost of doing business with Cuba in a significant way, and, in fact, we have had a significant reduction, 22 percent reduction, in the sale of agriculture products since the adoption of that rule.

This amendment that I offer today, Mr. Chairman, simply is a prohibition against the spending of any money to enforce that regulation and therefore return us to where we were prior to February of 2005.

It is identical language to what was included in the appropriation bill last year in both the House and the Senate. The language was removed in conference. But this House of Representatives and our companion body across the way adopted identical language in the Treasury/ Transportation appropriation bill a year ago.

And the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) has made that effort in 2005, which we all agreed to when this bill was adopted a year ago. So the sole purpose here today is to return us to preFebruary 2005.

We will probably have the opportunity to debate the value of trade with Cuba and what it means to the Castro government. And I welcome that opportunity. It seems to me that unilateral sanctions, we clearly can reach the conclusion that unilateral sanctions by the United States are only harmful to our own agriculture sector, to our own farmers, at a time in which drought affects much of the country. High energy and input costs are dramatically increasing.

It seems to me that there is no reason for us to make these sales more difficult. And, in fact, the reduction of those sales is almost 21 percent of corn, 17 percent of wheat, and 27 percent, 26 percent of meat products from the United States, reduction in those sales since the adoption of this rule.

This amendment is obviously supported by a wide array of farm organizations.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I negotiated the agreement that Mr. MORAN made reference to, along with my dear colleagues, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mrs. EMERSON. At that time Mr. Nethercutt was here. And the agreement stands.

The agreement authorized sales to the Cuban regime as long as payments were made, cash in advance. Now, the Cuban regime, and let us be clear when we talk about trade with Cuba that we are dealing, there are no Cubans, there are no Cubans who can buy, because it is a totalitarian state, the regime.

Now the dictator started to make purchases after the law was passed in October of 2000. And as is to be expected, then he started engaging in delaying tactics, precisely to create leverage and pressure so that we would see something like we see today. Sure enough, the delaying tactics began by the dictator.

And U.S. financial institutions asked for clarification of what ''cash in advance'' is. Now, it should not surprise us that the dictator started his delaying tactics, when we see the billions and billions of dollars that he owes to anyone who has given him credit.

It should not surprise anyone that he started, he began delaying tactics. The reality of the matter is, cash sales are allowed. The reality of the matter is that U.S. financial institutions asked for this clarification.

And also I want to make a separate point. President Bush is right, and I thank him once again for, today, having issued another very clear statement of administration policy, when he has stated from the first day of his administration that he has promised to veto any legislation that enriches the Cuban dictatorship or benefits the Cuban dictator's regime.

The President is right. I stand with him. I thank him once again. And I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to another negotiator of the deal, of the agreement that still stands and has not been changed by this regulation by President Bush, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Moran amendment. Let us be clear: This amendment is not about agricultural sales to Cuba. This amendment seeks to prevent the implementation of safeguards that have been put in place to ensure that American farmers do indeed get paid.

Under current U.S. law, the sale of agricultural products to Cuba is authorized. There are no sanctions in place for such sales. The law only stipulates that these sales meet four simple conditions: payment of cash in advance, of payment prior to transfer of title, shipping and a licensing provision.

Again, these requirements were put in place to protect American producers, to protect American taxpayers, so that they will in fact get paid by the Cuban regime, and that these sales are in keeping with the U.S. foreign policy and commercial interests.

Given the Castro regime history, and you can see right there in Mr. DIAZ-BALART's currency debt, and its history of insolvency, its poor credit rating, its debt levels, it is incumbent upon us in Congress to undertake necessary steps to protect Americans from getting cheated, from getting swindled, like so many others have by the Castro dictatorship.

Mr. Chairman, we have ample reasons to be concerned about the worthiness of the Castro regime. At $14 billion, Cuba's foreign debt reached an all-time high last year.

Cuba simply refuses to pay its debts. Now, we all know that the Cuban tyrant can afford it. Forbes Magazine recently listed him as among the top ten wealthiest rulers in the world. The U.S. must not allow its citizens to shoulder the burden of a corrupt foreign government, a deadbeat dictator.

Simply put, this amendment promotes lawlessness and the protection

of Americans against the Cuban regime's antics. I join Mr. DIAZ-BALART and so many others in hoping that we vote ''no'' on the Moran amendment.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is again, what part of payment, ''cash in advance'' is hard to understand?

Cash in advance means cash in advance. That is what the rules are right now. There is nothing changing that. That is what we need to keep. That is why we need to defeat this amendment.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of our time to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment and insist, again, that in order to deny economic resources to the Castro regime, it is imperative that we maintain the sanction and travel restrictions that are in place, and encourage the ordinary citizens of Cuba, and enable them the benefit of our sanctions that are aimed at trying to free the people of Cuba and end their oppression, end the oppression that they suffer under.

Again, I quote from the administration, ''Lifting the sanctions now or limiting our ability to enforce them, would provide assistance to a repressive regime at the expense of the ordinary Cuban people.''

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas to close debate.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, again, let me reiterate that this has nothing to do with changing the sanctions that are in place. The law remains. The administration created a new rule a year ago for which there is no commercial basis.

And the argument that farmers will not be paid, it is farm organizations and farmers who are supporting my amendment today. And, finally, the suggestion that we must save taxpayers expense, there are no taxpayer dollars involved in trade with Cuba. There is no subsidy. There is no agricultural credit provided.

This is really about a noncommercial reason, just trying to make the trade more onerous, more expensive, so that our farmers have less of an opportunity to export their goods to Cuba.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I would ask support. Return us to the compromise that was created prior to February of 2005.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1530

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RANGEL

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANGEL:

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

SEC. 9xx. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the economic embargo of Cuba, as defined in section 4(7) of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–114), except that the foregoing limitation does not apply to the administration of a tax or tariff.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment at the desk prevents all spending in support of the embargo against Cuba. I recognize this is a very emotional subject because so many people have personal memories of the dictatorship of Fidel Castro.

But this is not a pro-Castro amendment, this is a pro-American amendment. If we are going to get rid of this fellow, one thing that is clear, the embargo route is not the way to go. For 45 years, he has outlived all of our Presidents by being there. If anything, he has used the embargo as an excuse to continue his dictatorship. It hasn't done anything except hurt the Cuban people by having the negative economic impact on their government.

But more important than anything, it restricts the American people from doing what we should be able to do without being restricted by our government. Americans should be able to travel, period. Nobody should deny us the opportunity to go anywhere that we want to go. If we are going to be restricted because it is a Communist country, then the administration is saying they don't have confidence in us that we are going to be converted to communism.

What about capitalism, the whole idea of changing people's lives and thoughts through exchange of goods and wares? What about our farmers? What about those that want to invest in oil?

But, more importantly, what about those people that believe in not only economic freedom, but cultural freedom, educational freedom, song, dance, get to know people? The Cuban people love us and those who know them love the Cuban people.

It is this rascal that is in charge that we have lost billions of dollars in denying our people the opportunity to have economic exchange. That has not gained us one thing except perhaps a handful of votes in Florida.

Because America has to do what works. The embargo is not working any kind of way, and the meanness of it all, to deny Americans an opportunity to visit their families in Cuba, or to restrict it to once every 3 years, we have to check with the doctor to see whether or not your parents are sick enough or well enough so that you can plan your visit. That is not the American way of life.

The whole idea that you have sick and poor people in Cuba, and you are Cuban American, and you want to send some money to them, that that is being denied because the hard money is going to be used by the government.

I suggest that nobody in this House, even the lovely lady from Florida, is going to say that this program has worked. I know it is a political issue, and I am not belittling that. I know there is a lot of compassion behind it. But I will call this the American amendment, an amendment for Americans to travel where they want, to trade where they want, to entertain where they want, to listen to entertainment where they want, and to send money where they want and never be able to say that these people in Cuba that are being adversely affected are a threat to our national security.

If we love those people, we wouldn't cut off America to them. We would send America there with the American flag, with our young people, with hip-hop, with jeans, with all of the things that the whole world has come to enjoy. But to deny the people in Cuba this because we don't like or we hate or we want to get rid of this man who puts innocent people in jail or who shoots down harmless planes, if you want to get rid of him, bring America to Cuba but don't keep us out.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from New York (Mr. RANGEL). I know that he called this the For-America amendment, but I think it is the Blame America First amendment, because it says that if there is misery in Cuba, and there surely is, that it is the fault of the American people because of our foreign policy tools that we have been using of sanctioning the government of the regime of Fidel Castro.

I agree with the gentleman that the embargo should be lifted. It is the embargo that Fidel Castro has on the Cuban people, an embargo on freedom and an embargo on expression and an embargo on freedom to worship. That is the embargo that we would like to see lifted.

But here we go again. How interesting that we have this debate on today, of all days. This is Che Guevara's birthday, and Che Guevara, like Castro, was a bloody assassin, even though we have young people wearing

his T-shirts. They have no idea what that man stood for.

Like Che Guevara, Fidel Castro continues this bloody, tyrannical rule. Here we have an annual campaign to award an oppressive totalitarian state, a human rights violator, right here in our own hemisphere. If history has taught us nothing about the consequences of appeasing and awarding a brutal power hungry tyrant, we are again being asked to consider an amendment that in practice would lift all sanctions on the Cuban dictatorship as a reward for his good behavior.

In matter of fact, as the Cuban regime intensifies its crackdown on peaceful demonstration, people who are just for democracy, as it systematically harasses and seeks to intimidate our own U.S. Ambassador personnel in the U.S. Interests Section in Havana, as the regime increases its support to pariah states such as Iran and Syria, and the global jihadist organization, we should not, we cannot, we must not resolve that this is going to go unnoticed, that we will not be punishing Fidel Castro, that we will, in fact, be rewarding him for continuing to oppress his own people.

The misery that the Cuban people feel is Castro's own making. It is not the Blame America First crowd that wants you to believe that, but that is so.

There are three major conditions that must be in place before any sanctions are lifted on the Cuban regime. They are very simple. The liberation of political prisoners, the legalization of all political parties, and the holding of free, fair, multiparty, internationally recognized democratic elections.

This amendment suggests that demanding freedom, demanding democracy, demanding respect for human rights first is all too much to ask. I say it is not. The human rights condition in Cuba continues to deteriorate. Cuba's tyrannical rule punishes even harder those who seek to exercise their fundamental freedoms of expression, of assembly, of free association. As the steadily increasing number of Cuban political prisoners demonstrates, conditions are deplorable and the Cuban people are oppressed by this ruthless dictator.

So I ask you, are we to reward the imprisonment of peaceful demonstrators and independent journalists? No, I don't think we should. I don't think that we will.

Labor leaders, local civil rights activists, are being tortured today as we speak. They are being jailed by this tyrannical regime. In addition, sex trafficking is on the rise. According to our own State Department report on sexual trafficking, it says in Cuba women and children are trafficked for the purposes of sexual exploitation and forced child labor.

The Cuban regime does not meet even minimum standards for this so-called thriving sex trade, but rather participates, participates in the commercial, sexual exploitation of these women and children. Are we to reward these violent harassers, this intimidation, these human traffickers? No, we must not.

In a post-September 11 world, Mr. Chairman, Congress should not, we must not, help subsidize trade with a regime that is committed to the destruction of the U.S. Cuba provides safe haven for globally wanted fugitives and pursues even closer ties with Syria and Iran.

Let us not forget then in May of 2001 Fidel Castro said, together, Cuba and Iran will bring America to its knees. The imperialist king will finally fall.

Then, Cuba also voted no on an International Atomic Energy Agency that would have condemned Iran's nonproliferation obligations. I ask my colleagues to stand on the side of political prisoners and reject the Rangel amendment.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I think everyone in this Chamber appreciates Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN's commitment to human rights, and I salute her for that. However, I think we have to observe that the embargo hasn't stopped Castro, it hasn't stopped Cuba from progressing. It hasn't forced out Castro.

It certainly provided hurdles and extra expenses that have been felt by every Cuban in every sector of the economy that is desperate for a boost. Proponents of the embargo argue that constricting the Cuban economy will fuel discontent among the Cuban population with the current government and will force out Castro. That hasn't happened in 45 years.

Moreover, it didn't happen when the Cuban economy was at its worst period following the collapse of the Soviet Union in the early 1990s. But the desired outcome by the proponents of the embargo will not be achieved. In the process of forcing the embargo, the United States is paradoxically curtailing the freedom of its own citizens and the human rights and the very things for which the government criticizes Cuba.

Today, I might point out, to my good friend from Florida, it is not only Che Guevara's birthday, but it is also Flag Day in the United States. The values that we hold with our flag we could stand for in saying that the Cuban embargo ought to be taken down. In November of 2005, for the fourteenth year in a row, the U.N. General Assembly passed a resolution with the support of 182 Nations calling on the United States to immediately end its economic embargo against Cuba.

Nearly the whole world is opposing the embargo. Many U.S. allies have voiced concern that the extraterritorial application of U.S. embargo would infringe on their rights. It is time for a change in U.S. policy towards Cuba. It is time to craft a policy that is based on the values of the U.S. Constitution, the United Nations, human rights of pure logic and lift the embargo against Cuba.

I urge my colleagues to support the Rangel amendment and to support a new direction and a new day.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for a total of 4 minutes.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, thank you so much for your kind indulgence. I know that there is a lot of passion involved in those that oppose anything that would appear to be supporting a ruthless dictator in Cuba. I want you to know that if we had an opportunity to take a vote on this floor for or against Cuba, I would volunteer to get rid of Castro, because we are from Cuba, but we are not for Castro.

There is nothing in the embargo that punishes Castro. Certainly it seems to have enhanced his popularity. But be that as it may, for those people who want to get rid of the ruthless dictator, share with me what good it is to take a Cuban American that is here or a Cuban American that is here in America, and say that they can't send money back to Cuba to their family in a very poor country because we hate Castro.

How can we tell farmers that want to sell food to the Cuban people that you can't do it? We have to get special permission to send medicine and food, and even that is being opposed by some. How do you tell a kid that wants to go to Cuba and to learn not communism but learn about medicine, or why not have Cuban kids be able to come here to learn about our great republic, our great democracy?

□ 1545

How are we able to say that putting up a wall between the Cuban people and the American people is going to help get rid of this ruthless dictator? It would seem to me that we would have such pride in our ability to change the way people think about democracy by demonstrating it, but when you tell Americans who are so proud of ourselves that we are fortunate enough to live in the greatest Republic in the world, that we can brag about it in every city and every valley and every county in every country, but for God sake do not show the Communists in Cuba how proud you are, people who have never been able to enjoy any of the things that we just take for granted in this country.

But realistically and honestly, has this got anything to do with the people in Cuba over Castro? Or does it have to do with the electoral college system in Florida? Is this not where we concentrate to make certain that we are going to try to find out who hates Castro the most?

I wish we could change this debate around and have it to be who loves and

cares for the Cuban people the most. Why can we not expose them to our market of food and medicine and education and the ideals of freedom that was fought for in this country? Why can we not go there and be able to say that we are not afraid of Castro, they cannot lock us up, so if you lock those people who disagree with you up, then we will stand up there and say this is what democracy IS about? Who are the greatest advocates of freedom than free Americans?

I am suggesting that let us take the politics out of this. Let us take the embargo out of this. Let us be proAmerican, and those people who refuse to allow our American flag to be carried by Americans to Cuba, they are the ones that are stopping democracy; because I will suggest to you that any American that is so proud of what we have been able to do, we may have obstacles to overcome, but we love our country. We preach about how great it is, especially when we are overseas. Do not deny Americans the right to be able to say how great democracy is, and do not put a cap on our capitalism. Let us be able to sell to whomever wants to buy from us and do not blame it all on Castro because he is not being hurt.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman KNOLLENBERG.

I was pleased to hear that our colleague from the other side of the aisle said that, I think he said something like he would vote for democracy in Cuba. When we have had opportunities in this Chamber, as late as May of 2005, to condemn the human rights violations, I see that he has voted ''no.'' So I am glad that perhaps some progress on that issue may be being made.

Mr. Chairman, which of the conditions that Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN mentioned, which are in our law for the immediate lifting of U.S. sanctions, the sweeping of trade, the arrival of massive trade and tourism and financing, which of the conditions in our law that make that access to the U.S. market, that are contingent for that access to the U.S. market, which are the conditions mentioned by our colleague, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN? The liberation of all political prisoners, the legalization of all political parties, labor unions, the press and the holding of free elections, which of those conditions are objectionable?

We want to see the sanctions lifted. What we want to see are the people of Cuba, 90 miles from our shores and oppressed for 47 years by a totalitarian tyrant, we want to see them freed. We want the political prisoners freed. We want their political parties legalized. We want to see them with free elections. Which of the conditions are objectionable?

Is it correct to lift, to reward that tyranny now, unilaterally, while the prisons are full of men and women, prisoners of conscience, who peacefully advocate for freedom and democracy, the freedom that we are here exercising today? For example, one of them, an independent journalist, Guillermo Farinas, is on the verge of death as we speak because he entered a hunger strike 4 months ago for the right as an independent journalist to access the Internet and to be able to have and send e-mail, and he is on a hunger strike, on the verge of death as we speak.

What is objectionable with our insistence to that tyranny that that political prisoner be released and all the others and political parties be legalized and the Cuban people have access like the rest of this hemisphere has to free and fair elections, multiparty elections? What is so objectionable? Why the different treatment? Why is it that we insist on free elections for countries throughout the world, but our neighbors 90 miles away, no, no; for them let us unilaterally reward the tyrant and give him what he seeks.

No, this amendment must be defeated once again, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this amendment wants to lift all sanctions unilaterally on the regime that, among other things, has invited the President of Iran to visit in the next few months because the Cuban regime supports Iran's nuclear program. It is on the list of states that sponsor terrorism, and yet, how do some Members, how does this amendment want to deal with that terrorist state? By unilaterally asking nothing in return, helping that regime with billions and billions of dollars from here, from the United States, so that that terrorist regime can continue to oppress and also do what it used to do when it had money.

Let us not forget the American GIs that died in Grenada fighting that regime's thugs. Do we really want to fund an antiAmerican terrorist state just 90 miles away, particularly in a time of war? Absolutely not. It makes no sense. It is absolutely ludicrous.

So I would ask you to once again soundly defeat this amendment. It makes no sense.

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

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the two previous gentlemen who just spoke, the issue is not whether we like Mr. Castro or not. I think Castro has an abominable human rights record. I think he has an idiotic economic record. The issue, rather, is whether or not we trust our fellow citizens.

I would also say that the issue to the question I would ask is why should the United States follow a policy which allows Castro to pretend that the United States and its embargo is one of the reasons for his economic and political failures. I think we make it easier for Castro to survive by our own silliness.

That is why I support the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

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

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I hoped we would not distort the argument. If we can have a petition to circulate tomorrow, where we can support the release of all political prisoners, where we can condemn the dictatorship of Castro, hey, I would want to be a part of circulating it.

I do hope that sometime you might try to explain to the American people how we are supporting Castro because we say that a Cuban American that wants to visit their sick parents or their brother and sister, how that compassionate visit is supporting communism.

I would like to know how would supporting Castro, if what we are saying is that we want to send some money to poor families that are there, but we cannot do it because we hate Castro and we would be rewarding him, I would like to know how we are rewarding him when our farmers are denied the opportunity during the time they have to export food, the pharmaceuticals, the people who export the American dream, I would want to know as we put a cap on capitalism, how this is rewarding Castro?

No, I think it has been said by many people. Castro uses us as a vehicle for his dictatorship. And the people who are in prison, I think if we had more Americans there and people from other countries there condemning his conduct, do you think that Americans would be locked up by this dictator if our youngsters were able to go there and protest there as they are so easily able to do it here?

Why do you not open up this door and acknowledge, this is a Floridian problem. This is a political problem. This is who-hates-Castro-the-most type of problem.

I submit to you, if you were to take this and say who likes the American people, who loves the American people the most, how can we help them the best, I would think it is to bring them medical care, to bring them food, to bring them help, to bring them technology and wrap it all up in the American flag and dare them to contest what we are doing because we are the freedom-loving people. We do not ban people from going to places, and I do not want to give up my democracy because of some feeling that people have of their own politics, which has nothing to do with my great country.

Castro is not a threat to the United States of America. He is a threat to whether Republicans or Democrats gets votes out of Florida. The Cuban people are not a threat to our national security. They are always offering to send doctors here, to send blood here,

because they love our way of life. If Castro is an impediment for them being able to know and enjoy what America stands for, then let Americans go there, especially Cuban Americans who know the tyranny of Cuba and know the freedom that they have enjoyed in Florida and New Jersey and New York and throughout these States.

Who could be a better ambassador for freedom, an embargo or people who have known the pains of dictatorship and the love and the joy of the American way of life?

So do what you want to do politically, but do not take away Americans' rights to be able to enjoy the hearts, the culture, the education, the music and all of the things that we have been able to enjoy, really, merely because you are trying to pick up a seat or two in the State of Florida. It is not fair to the Cuban people. It is not fair to the American people, and it is not fair to our Constitution.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Rangel amendment.

If we want an effective foreign policy that prepares the United States for a post-Castro transition, we need to engage with our Cuban neighbors.

Until very recently this Administration has not engaged with Iran—to the detriment of U.S. national security interests.

Similarly, not engaging with Cuba has resulted in the loss of trade opportunities for U.S. manufacturers and the U.S. agricultural industry, and prevented the opportunity to develop a civil society within Cuba that is sympathetic to U.S. interests.

We need to recognize the failure of silent diplomacy.

This deafening silence will prevent a smooth transition to a post-Castro government—both for Cubans and for U.S. national security.

Now is the time to establish diplomatic relations with Cuba—lifting the embargo will:

Encourage cultural exchanges that build understanding between Americans and Cubans;

Enable Cuban Americans to visit their relatives just like other Americans whose relatives live in places other than Cuba; and

Engage democratic reform.

I urge my colleagues to support the Rangel Amendment and end the embargo against Cuba.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

Mr. RANGEL. 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 New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. LEE:

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

SEC. 9xx. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the amendments made to paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 515.565 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to specific licenses for United States academic institutions and other specific licenses), as published in the Federal Register on June 16, 2004 (69 Fed. Reg. 33772). The limitation in the preceding sentence shall not apply to the implementation, administration, or enforcement of section 515.560(c)(3) of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

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

My amendment is very simple, and it really, quite frankly, should be noncontroversial. It was unanimously approved by this body in 2004, and it deserves to be passed again this year.

This amendment prohibits funds in the bill from being used to enforce regulations promulgated on June 30, 2004 that included severely restricted and, in many cases, eliminated opportunities for American students to study in Cuba. There are no valid reasons for needing to restrict the rights of Americans, especially our young people, to travel abroad and study abroad.

□ 1600

Whether or not you support the United States embargo against Cuba, you should support American national security interests, educational exchanges, and civil liberties that this amendment promotes.

Mr. Chairman, the Office of Foreign Assets Control within the Department of the Treasury is tasked with tracking the finances of terrorists, international narcotics, and weapons of mass destruction. However, in 2003, the Miami Herald reported that this office had six times more personnel working on Cuba licensing than trafficking bin Laden.

Now, that is a fact, and it doesn't make any sense. OFAC shouldn't waste their time prosecuting and tracking average Americans, especially our students. We have other real pressing national security concerns, and people watching this debate at home should, quite frankly, be outraged, especially when we consider that the State Department and the 9/11 Commission both underscored the importance of students in spreading American values. They are our best goodwill ambassadors.

Patricia Harrison, the former Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, stated repeatedly that ''one of our greatest assets in public diplomacy is the American people themselves. Programs that bring Americans and foreign citizens in direct contact can and do have tremendous positive impact.'' That is what she said.

The bipartisan Commission report, the 9/11 report, recommends that we rebuild the scholarship exchange and library programs that reach out to young people and offer them knowledge and hope. But our policy on Cuba continues to do just the opposite.

Most importantly, this amendment addresses the issue of basic civil liberties. American students should be able to travel freely and gain invaluable experience that only study abroad programs can provide. Our students simply want the opportunity to conduct their studies, learn about other cultures, and make independent judgments for themselves. Students can participate in exchanges with China, why not Cuba?

Simply said, any policy that restricts United States educational exchanges should not be approved or supported. They are in every sense anti-American and contradict our values and our ideals. This amendment is straightforward and should not be controversial, so I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the Lee amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida seek time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

A couple of points of clarification. Currently, U.S. law already allows individual members of religious organizations to travel to Cuba for religious purposes. The only requirements, of course, is that they have a specific license, and that is a safeguard in U.S. law to ensure that travel is in fact for the stated purpose and not for the purpose of tourism.

Again, current regulations ensure that the financial donations are not provided to the regime, that terrorist regime, that murderous, terrorist regime, under the guise of religious activity. And the current law seeks to prevent the manipulation of legitimate activities to practice or share as one may believe about the Cuban people.

Why is that important? Well, I have this board here, and I hope you can see it, the American people can see it. Why is it so important that we are careful about how this goes? Because the regime in Cuba is a regime that promotes pedophilia, promotes sexual tourism, including with children. And let me read this quote. ''Cuba has a tourism industry, government operated or affiliated, and it engages in promoting child prostitution.''

Yes, child prostitution, which is not only trafficking under our law, United States law, but under U.N. protocol. And it is done very openly. This just came out recently. This came out just recently.

So again, yes, the law provides that you can do it, as long as it is real. It is not just to do other things, such as what that terrorist regime promotes

and sponsors, like pedophilia and child prostitution.

I will note that the sponsor of this amendment said that the American people would be ashamed, or would be appalled, I guess—I don't want to quote her, but in essence—if they saw this debate. It is ironic that when, for example, myself, and now Senator, then Congressman MENENDEZ proposed resolutions just condemning the crackdown of the dissidents in Cuba, condemning the crackdown against the freedom of press in Cuba, most of this Congress voted in favor of that resolution condemning the crackdown.

Only 22 Members of this House voted against those resolutions, bipartisan resolutions, condemning the crackdown on the free press, condemning the crackdown on the peaceful opposition movement in Cuba. The distinguished Member who was here before who said that he would support a resolution condemning the regime is on record not 20 years ago, not 10 years ago, just last year against even condemning the crackdown against the free press. Against even that. It would be interesting to find out where the sponsor of this amendment was. Was she condemning the crackdown? Did she vote with us to condemn the crackdown, or did she support the Castro regime even when they were doing the crackdown?

The bottom line is this, my dear friends. There is a terrorist regime just 90 miles away from the United States with close ties to Iran, to North Korea, and other nasty, horrible, murderous terrorist regimes. In itself the Cuba regime is a terrorist regime. This is not the time to be helping anti-American terrorist regimes with funding or in ways in which the terrorist regime can obtain more funding.

I would respectfully ask this amendment also once again be strongly defeated.

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me first say that if the gentleman would look at what the current regulations do, they are very restrictive in terms of allowing for students to participate in student exchanges. We want to make sure that our American students are allowed to participate in educational exchanges in the same manner in which they participate in educational exchanges with other countries. That is what this amendment is about.

Our young people should not be denied the opportunity to visit countries, to participate in legitimate academic programs. We are not talking about a 2-week summer program, we are talking about a semester, a year, a 2-year program, an academic program that students would like to participate in to be able to gain knowledge of a different culture. As they do with China, they would like to learn that about Cuba.

They would like to participate in their academic curriculum in foreign countries, like they do everywhere in the world. Cuba should not be distinguished. And part of the reason that they can't go should not be because of our United States policy towards Cuba. Students deserve to be able to study abroad.

That is all this amendment does. It provides those options for them to participate in educational exchanges in a country 90 miles away. That is all this is about. Our young people deserve that, and it is amazing to me that we can deny kids the chance to grow and to develop and to say what they believe in terms of a country's culture, foreign policy, and academic institutions. They should be able to do this for themselves, see for themselves, study, and learn. That is what this amendment is about. It is not about U.S. policy toward Cuba.

Finally, let me just say that many groups around the country have supported this amendment. The Emergency Coalition in Defense of Educational Travel, the NAACP, the Washington Office on Latin America, and the Freedom to Travel Campaign.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in strong opposition to my good friend, Ms. LEE's, amendment.

The proponents of this amendment say that it would allow American students to travel to Cuba. The reality is that under current law educational trips to Cuba by American students are permitted. The restrictions do exist, however, and they are in place in order to ensure that American students studying in Cuba are indeed engaging in legitimate educational activities with substantive academic and cultural components.

This is in contrast to the time before the regulations were put in place in July of 2004. What was happening then? Students were participating in activities with little or no educational merit. These trips were organized under the guise of educational activity but they were in fact spring break getaways and island shopping excursions.

We have to understand and remember that when this amendment was offered last year the elected leaders of the opposition in Cuba wrote a letter to every Member of Congress saying please defeat this amendment; this does not help our cause for freedom.

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

To continue this intellectual discussion between Florida and California, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Lee amendment to prohibit the use of funds to enforce regulations restricting access to educational programs for students who wish to study in Cuba.

Mr. Chairman, throughout the Cold War, American students studied in the Soviet Union. Many of them went on to become diplomats, scholars, and policymakers who used the knowledge they gained to contribute to the development and implementation of U.S. foreign policy. Similarly, many Americans are studying in the People's Republic of China today. There is no reason to treat study in Cuba differently.

Study abroad provides valuable educational experiences for American students and contributes to the development of knowledge and informed professionals who can use their knowledge to serve our country in the future. I urge my colleagues to support the Lee amendment and support educational opportunities for American students in Cuba and throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, I have been to Cuba many times. I have been to the great medical university. Castro has trained over 60,000 doctors. I think they will be the first to come forward with a real cure for HIV and AIDS. Don't deny our students the opportunity to share in this very rich culture, despite the fact that we have an embargo.

I would urge support for this amendment.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to clarify a couple of points that the opponents of this amendment have said.

First of all, currently the licenses for participation in student exchanges are valid for only 1 year, rather than 2. We want to return back to the 2 years.

Also, only students who are provided educational opportunities in the undergraduate and graduate level institutions can participate in these restricted licenses. No high schools, no other educational institutions are allowed to participate in Cuba travel.

Also, employees who travel under the license must be full-time permanent employees of the licensed institution, which prevents many teachers and many professors from participating with their students as they travel to Cuba.

Also, all people-to-people educational travel was eliminated in 2003, and that ended thousands of educational visits by United States citizens to Cuba for broader educational purposes. Educational activities in Cuba now may be no shorter than 10 weeks, unless they are for the purpose of graduate research. Now, this eliminates scores of valuable educational programs to Cuba that were really a few weeks long.

Finally, let me just say that it doesn't make any sense to deny students, once again, the opportunity to participate in educational programs abroad. Cutting off these opportunities makes no sense. It really is a violation of their civil liberties. It goes against who we are as Americans.

Our young people are hopeful for the possibilities of a new world free of all the politics that we have heard today.

□ 1615

So why don't we give them a chance to participate?

So all this amendment would do would be to revert back to the 2003 prior regulations which for many of us were very restrictive also, but we are just asking to go back to those regulations so that our young people will have the broadest possible opportunity to participate in educational exchanges, given the unfortunate status of the United States policy toward Cuba.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I noted with interest that the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee stated that he was interested in this intellectual exercise. Perhaps this could be because we are in a free Parliament, in a democracy, and it could be interpreted as an intellectual exercise.

But I will tell you for whom this issue is not an intellectual exercise. When a year ago, despite the totalitarian nature of the Cuban regime, over 100 delegates from the peaceful prodemocracy movement managed to meet. Many others were not able to meet. They were stopped. They were arrested. For many reasons many others were not allowed, but over 100 did manage to meet in assembly. And they elected leaders and principles.

Those leaders sent us a year ago, after their assembly, after this amendment, the same amendment and a few others had been filed, a statement of position with regard to the amendments, including this one that was filed a year ago.

Now, of these three leaders, the elected leaders of the prodemocracy leader in Cuba, one was thrown in the gulag after sending this letter, where he is today. He remains uncharged. Who knows if the dictator will ever charge him? He was sent to the gulag and he is today in that inferno gulag after sending us his position. That is not an intellectual exercise; it is an exercise of extraordinary heroism.

And they stated in the letter that those amendments, and one of them was this one, if any of them would be passed, that Cuban regime in Havana, which has given continuous examples of its absolute immovability and of its repressive and antidemocratic vocation, would consider such amendments unilateral actions by this Congress as a policy of accommodation with the regime. So this is not an intellectual exercise.

We are dealing with a tyranny of 47 years. And let no one be confused. Despite the 47-year duration of that tyranny, let no one be confused that for one single day the Cuban people have failed to fight for their freedom. And they will be free and the tyrant who is about to celebrate his 80th birthday will soon be elsewhere and the Cuban people will be free.

By the way, statements like the resolution that was mentioned recently, that only 22 Members of this House voted against, in support of the prodemocracy movement and in condemnation of the violation of the human rights of the Cuban people, those statements and manifestations by this Congress will always be seen as admirable, admirable statements of solidarity of the people who deserve to be free and who will be free despite 47 years of oppression.

So I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to once again stand for the rights of the Cuban people to live in freedom. And these amendments, like this one which seeks to confuse, because it is already legal for Americans with educational purposes to get a license and study in Cuban, but not to engage in child prostitution and not to engage in the endeavors of the regime, like our State Department has stated publicly just a few days ago on the record, Ambassador John R. Miller, Ambassador-at-Large on International Slavery: Cuba has a tourism industry, government operated or affiliated, which engages in promoting child prostitution, which is not only trafficking under United States law but under United Nations protocol, and it is done very openly.

That is among the realities, the horrible realities of the Cuban tyranny which will soon come to an end but that we must continue to condemn and we must continue to reject unilateral rewards for. So I ask my colleagues to vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

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

Ms. LEE. 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 California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

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

SEC. ____. Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall conduct a study to determine the amount each State department of transportation spent in fiscal year 2005 to comply with laws and regulations of the United States Department of Transportation.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, many times Members come with their amendments to the floor and say I have a commonsense amendment to present. Sometimes they are common sense and simple, and sometimes they are not. I would hazard the statement that this one is simple and a commonsense amendment that I make today. And it is one that I have made on the floor over the last several weeks with regard to some of the other appropriations bills as well.

It is simply to try to rein in some of the spending that we do here in Washington, to put some sort of a reasonable limit on some of the spending that we do because, you know, when you listen to all of the debates back and forth when we discuss the budget and other such matters, we differ on how we get here on some of these issues, but one thing that we do not seem to differ on is that we are spending too much and our debt is too high in this country.

If we can try to rein that in and bring down some of that debt, it is a good thing. And that is what this amendment does. This amendment puts a reasonable limit on the number of Federal employees that can attend out-of-this-country international conferences.

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I am very willing to accept the amendment. I think it is a good amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I appreciate that, and I will just briefly conclude by saying that I appreciate the acceptance of the amendment to make sure that as we go forward, the Federal Government limits the number of employees who go overseas. We do not say that there should be no one traveling. We recognize the importance of staff, both here on the floor, and we recognize the importance of staff as far as Federal agencies are concerned, but if we put a reasonable number, as the chairman just accepted, I think we are doing a good thing for the American taxpayer.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

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

SEC. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to apply the assumption contained in section A150.101(d) of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise at this time for purposes of engaging in a colloquy with the gentlemen from Michigan and Massachusetts, which was the intent of bringing up the amendment so that we would have an opportunity to discuss a very important issue.

Sometimes it takes money, but sometimes it takes policy. We recognize that one of the advantages of modern life is the convenience of air travel. America's air transportation system is the best and safest in the world, but airports are not quiet. If you ask any resident that lives near a busy airport, you will hear many grievances about the noise level.

Although there is no way to make airports soundproof, it is possible to reduce airport noise so it is less disruptive to the lives of the families that live near some of the Nation's busiest airports, work and pay their taxes.

Under the Airport Improvement Program administered by the FAA, grants are available to airports and local governments to fund noise reduction projects located in areas significantly affected by airport noise above 65 decibels over a 24-hour average, as indicated by the notation 65 dB(A) DNL. Noise mitigation grants are generally not available for areas in which the noise level may be substantial but does not exceed the 65 dB(A) DNL. Thereby, money does not solve the problem; policy does.

However, substantial impacts occur to millions of people well below the 65 decibel level. This value is inadequate for several reasons:

From a scientific perspective, it is not supported by research. The 65 decibel level is derived from the Schultz Curve which correlated people reporting being highly annoyed by noise with noise levels.

Substantial impact occurs well before people become highly annoyed. In addition, the data used in the Schultz Curve for airports shows that ''highly annoyed'' occurs around 57 decibels, not 65, and that comes from a Journal of the Acoustical Society of America.

The EPA has identified 55 dB(A) DNL as a more appropriate noise level. The day/night average sound level is the level of noise expressed in decibels as a 24-hour average, and averages do not adequately account for the impacts of aircraft noise on individuals.

Research has shown that noise disruption as low as 55 decibels can negatively affect communities near airports. Unfortunately, communities that have a dB(A) less than 65 are precluded from applying for an Airport Improvement Program grant to reduce airport noise. We need to help them. I have even heard from cities in Minnesota. It is all over the country.

It is important to stress that this amendment does not entitle any airport, local government or other eligible entity to receive a noise mitigation grant. Nor does it have any financial impact. This amendment only affects an applicant's eligibility to be considered for an airport noise reduction grant. Each applicant must demonstrate that its proposed project deserves to be funded, but no applicant can be disqualified from consideration merely because the area covered by the grant request does not have a dB(A) DNL greater than 65.

I would ask the gentleman to agree to work with me and, of course, others in this Congress who have similar interests for the betterment of the airports and airlines and airline travel, but also for those hardworking taxpaying communities to provide some relief to these affected communities. And I would yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. My understanding is that the gentlewoman is willing to withdraw the amendment, presuming I will work with you?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I am yielding to the gentleman.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. If you withdraw the amendment, I am prepared to work with you any way that I can, but the amendment would have to be withdrawn, so I am just asking for a guarantee that the amendment will be withdrawn.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I think the colloquy states.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Well, it states it in reverse, and that is my question. I thank you for the layout of the information here. You certainly raise an important issue, and I pledge to explore the issue with you further.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman very much for acknowledging the importance of this issue, and that it impacts many communities in addition to Houston and the district that I represent. With that in mind, I hope we will be able to march towards efforts both with the authorizers and the subcommittee to be able to work on this.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment of the gentlewoman from Texas is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

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

SEC. ____. Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall conduct a study to determine the amount each State department of transportation spent in fiscal year 2005 to comply with laws and regulations of the United States Department of Transportation.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I recognize the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, it was just yesterday we were on this floor honoring the work of former President Dwight Eisenhower and also celebrating the 50th anniversary of the national interstate highway system.

□ 1630

That system that he was the champion of for a number of years beforehand and finally got done, that system that we today bear the fruit, enjoy the fruit of. That system that was, in essence, put in place to connect border to border, east to west, north to south, the major urban areas and the city areas of this country, primarily for a national defense purposes was what the President had in mind. That system, as I say, was started 50 years ago. That system, of course, was also completed 20 years ago. And as I mentioned on the floor just yesterday, I believe that the former President and great general that he was, would want us, as we go into the second half of that century to be able to stand on his shoulders of the work that he was able to accomplish and now move on to a more progressive and appropriate system for this century.

Under the current system, it is sort of a top-down approach as far as transportation dollars are concerned. Even though States spend twice as much money on our transportation system in the country than the Federal Government does, we are all aware of the fact that there is an 18-cent gasoline tax in every State. That money comes from your respective State to Washington, D.C., through the hands of the bureaucrats down here where the decisions are made and then reallocated with the things that we read about in the paper as well as far as some of the programs and dollars where they are spent. Things that our taxpayers probably just scratch their head and wonder what is Washington doing with those dollars. I would gather the local officials, county, municipal and State officials also wonder just what Washington is doing with those transportation dollars as well.

To that end, I have introduced legislation called the Surface Transportation and Taxation Equity Act, the STATE Act for short. And that is a piece of legislation that simply says this: That States should be allowed, if they so desire, to opt out of the Federal gasoline and transportation system and make those decisions right at home instead.

See, right now, States are either donor States or donee States. States like the State of New Jersey, which is my own, is a donor State. We send more to Washington as far as gasoline taxes than we ever get back in return, so we are, in effect, subsidizing the other States. But even donee States, even those States that think that they are doing well by this system, may not be. And the reason I say that is this. Even though they are getting a little bit more, a few pennies back on the dollar more than they send to Washington, the problem is there are strings attached to those dollars. Washington just doesn't turn those dollars back to those donee States nor in to the donor States without any restrictions. They don't turn them back carte blanche. Washington, the bureaucrats, put restrictions on them. But what exactly do those restrictions cost the States? What do they cost through the micromanagement that Washington does to those States? What does it cost those respective States inasmuch as they are not able to spend the dollars as the citizens of those States feel are most appropriate? What does it cost at the end of the day in wasted Federal and local taxes?

So what this amendment does, to get to the bottom of it, is simply do a study. Let's get the facts. Let's find out what it is, in fact, costing the States to comply with this top-down, inefficient, outdated system of funding and building our roads and bridges across this country.

This amendment simply asks the U.S. Department of Transportation to conduct a study to determine the amount each State spends to comply with the regulations of the USDOT and whether or not there are programs that they are spending on that the sovereign States do not intend for them to spend it on. So in the end this is simply an amendment asking for a study to ask for full disclosure so that we both in Washington and at the local level and the taxpayers as well know exactly where their dollars are going to, where they are coming from and whether they are being put to the best use.

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

POINT OF ORDER

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

The rule states, in pertinent part, an amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law. The amendment imposes additional duties. I ask now for a ruling from the Chair. I think that would be the appropriate step.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, at this point, recognizing the point of order raised and setting it out, I at this point seek unanimous consent for withdrawing the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BISHOP of New York:

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

SEC. ____. (a) Congress finds that (1) Trans World Airlines (TWA) Flight 800 crashed off the coast of Long Island, New York, on July 17, 1996, resulting in one of the worst air disasters in United States history; and (2) since the crash of TWA Flight 800, numerous technological advances have enhanced passenger safety on airlines.

(b) On the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the crash of TWA Flight 800, Congress (1) offers condolences to the surviving families and friends of the 230 passengers and crew who perished as a result of the crash; and (2) recognizes the importance of continually upgrading aircraft technology, particularly with regard to the flammability of fuel tanks, to safeguard the flying public.

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

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is a straightforward, nonpartisan resolution commemorating one of the worst air disasters in history. Nearly a decade ago, on July 17, 1996, the world witnessed as TWA Flight 800 crashed off the coast of Long Island in the Atlantic Ocean just south of my district. All 230 passengers and crew perished.

Today it is important that we continue to offer our support by joining the surviving families who will recognize the 10th anniversary of that tragedy next month and we must do all that we can to safeguard the flying public against future disasters.

Like other challenging times our Nation has faced, the reaction to the Flight 800 catastrophe brought out the best not only in my constituents but in so many others in the surrounding towns, States and across the Nation who joined New Yorkers in mourning the loss of so many who lost their lives and who helped my community recover from its most horrific tragedy.

New Yorkers, indeed, all Americans demonstrated the great human strength and spirit that makes our country prevail in the face of tremendous adversity. Thousands of volunteers and employees of the Coast Guard, U.S. Navy, Army Corps of Engineers and the NTSB searched the waters below where the plane fell in an unprecedented search and recovery effort. Throughout and despite their grief the families of the victims worked tirelessly to build a permanent memorial with the help of Navy Seabees and thousands of dedicated local building trades union members. Today this solemn monument spirals along a strip of Long Island's south shore and serves as a constant reminder of our community's tremendous loss one decade ago.

As we approach this milestone, it is important to take stock of our progress in preventing air disasters since Flight 800. From a technological perspective, we have made some great strides towards aviation safety, particularly, for example, with design upgrades and an ongoing effort to mitigate fuel tank flammability, the cause of the Flight 800 crash.

It is also important to once again offer our condolences to the families of the Flight 800 disaster and assure them of our steadfast commitment to safety and of our vigilance against preventable catastrophes.

I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

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

The rule states, in pertinent part, an amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if it is changing existing law. The amendment proposes to state a legislative position. And so I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York or any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Only that in my view this is a very benign, very straightforward amendment. It does just two things. It offers the condolences of the Congress to the survivors of the tragedy and it reasserts our commitment to air travel safety.

I understand the point of order. I guess I would respectfully request that the chairman acknowledge that this is a benign and straightforward amendment and not impose the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The amendment proposes to express a legislative sentiment. As such, the amendment constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now

resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

Amendment by Mr. OBERSTAR of Minnesota.

Amendment by Mr. RANGEL of New York.

Amendment by Ms. LEE of California.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 214, noes 214, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 282]

AYES—214

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

NOES—214

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Hart
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
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)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Brady (TX)
Cannon
Miller (MI)
Rothman
Sessions

□ 1705

Messrs. SHERWOOD, HULSHOF, WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. EMERSON and Mrs. NORTHUP changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. BOREN changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBERSTAR

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 291, noes 137, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 283]

AYES—291

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bass
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bono
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Drake
Duncan
Edwards
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Leach
Lee

Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—137

Aderholt
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Crenshaw
Cubin
Davis (KY)
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Ehlers
Everett
Feeney
Flake
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Goodlatte
Granger
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Neugebauer
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Schmidt
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Sullivan
Tanner
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Van Hollen
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—4

Becerra
Miller (MI)
Rothman
Sessions

□ 1711

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RANGEL

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 245, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 284]

AYES—183

Abercrombie
Allen
Baird
Baldwin
Bean
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Emerson
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Herseth
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Honda
Hooley
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shays
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Woolsey
Wynn

NOES—245

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Berkley
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Engel
English (PA)
Etheridge
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Higgins
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Turner
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Blackburn
Miller (MI)
Rothman
Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 1718

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 236, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 285]

AYES—187

Abercrombie
Allen
Baird
Baldwin
Bass
Bean
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emerson
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kolbe
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shays
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Woolsey
Wynn

NOES—236

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Berkley
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boren
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carnahan
Carter
Case
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Cleaver
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Blackburn
Boehner
Hunter
Marchant
Meeks (NY)
Miller (MI)
Norwood
Rothman
Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 1724

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the last four lines.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, the District of Columbia and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2007''.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I want to address two issues in H.R. 5576, the Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, Judiciary and District of Columbia Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (TTHUD) that are of great interest to the Fifth District of Missouri: first, the need to redesignate funds in the SAFETEA–LU program to address critical traffic problems along a stretch of highway known as "Death Valley," and second, the woefully inadequate resources for housing and community development.

Let me begin by thanking Chairman JOE KNOLLENBERG and Ranking Member JOHN OLVER both of the House Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation and Chairman DON YOUNG and Ranking Member JIM OBERSTAR both of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for all of their hard work on this measure. I know it is through their efforts that we have this bill and I will have the opportunity to help my district fix an alarming problem.

I prepared a very simple amendment to make a technical correction to redesignate funds, and alleviate traffic at one of the most dangerous intersections in Missouri's 5th Congressional District: the intersection of M–291 Highway and Courtney Road in Sugar Creek, Missouri.

Originally, this SAFETEA–LU allocation would have designated $1.6 million for one highway project in my district, and the amendment would have fully transferred the designation to the City of Sugar Creek, so that they could have alleviated the traffic problems along a different stretch of high-traffic highway known as "Death Valley."

Within a 22 month span, there were 31 traffic accidents. In 1997, there were 87 accidents and 2 fatalities. In the summer 1998, five people died within two days in traffic accidents.This stretch has truly earned its nickname, and the area has only grown busier.

Overall, there is a large number of truck and car traffic crossing from the outer roadways of M–291 at an uncontrolled intersection North of Kentucky Road and South of Courtney Road. This redesignation would facilitate construction to finish the East and West outer-roadways to Courtney Road to allow for traffic to move safely through controlled intersections.

Until now, the City has only been able to do minimally protective measures, such as reducing the speed limit and adding a red light violator camera system. This redesignation would improve public safety by finishing the extension of the East and West outer roadways and adding desperately needed traffic outlets.

Mr. Chairman, I withdrew my amendment after conversations and assurances with the good Chairmen and Ranking Members, that a more appropriate vehicle for this technical correction and redesignation would be coming up for consideration shortly. I look forward to working with the Chairmen and Ranking Members so that we can put an end to "Death Valley."

Today, I reluctantly cast my vote in favor of H.R. 5576. While this legislation allows current 2006-level funding for vital programs affecting

the citizens of the 5th Congressional District such as Section 202 housing for the elderly and Section 811 housing for the disabled and slightly increases Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) and Home Funds for programs that directly affect low to moderate income families in our neighborhoods, it also zero's out several programs that have had and would continue to have a significant impact on the revitalization and continued growth of the cities and neighborhoods of the 5th District. The programs targeted to receive no funds include the CDBG Section 8 program, Brownfield program, and Youthbuild program.

In Kansas City, Missouri alone the Section 108 and Brownfield programs have been successfully used to fund job producing economic development like the Vista Hotel, the first Section 108 HUD loan in the nation, Quality Hill neighborhood, 18th and Vine, the Westside Industrial Park (DST plant), H & R Block National Equipment Repair Facility on Brush Creek, Swope Park Health Facility and a number of commercial developments, to name a few. Neighborhoods such as Brooklyn Heights (the old Municipal Stadium site), Little Sisters of the Poor Housing Redevelopment, and subdivisions such as Citidal Gardens and Renaissance Place and elderly developments such as the Residences at West Paseo (the old Robinson Hospital) utilized these programs. None of these developments would be here today without Section 108 and Brownfield funds.

Youthbuild programs have provided vocational training and job opportunities for numerous young people in our district to learn building trades. By combining classroom and practical experience, Youthbuild has enabled participants to get decent jobs that pay a livable wage. In Kansas City, Swope Community Builders in KC received a $700K Youthbuild grant this year (2006) to train 60 youth ages 16 to 24 in homebuilding trades and build two affordable houses for sale. Participants can also get a GED if they didn't graduate from high school. Funding for this program was eliminated in the bill.

Because the House majority leadership has chosen to ignore the successes of these programs and turn a blind eye to the needs of cities that require these ''community building tools'' for future revitalization, I am calling on the Senate, including Missouri's Senators BOND and TALENT, to restore these beneficial programs in the Senate appropriations bill.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, this bill is far from perfect, but I believe it is worth supporting.

The bill provides important resources to help support our nation's transportation systems, community and economic development. Examples of this include $8.9 billion for federal transit programs, which is an increase above the Fiscal Year 2006 allocation and the request made by the Bush Administration. Included in this funding is support for light rail projects in the Denver Metropolitan Area, which will help to reduce congestion on Colorado roadways.

Communities throughout Colorado and the nation rely on CDBG funds to provide decent housing and expand economic opportunities so I am pleased the legislation rejects the Bush Administration proposal to cut funding to the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG).

I am also pleased the full house has supported projects specific to the 2nd Congressional District including: $4.2 million for a replacement tower at the Jefferson County Airport, $500,000 for construction to relieve peak hour overcrowding, reduce accidents, and improve access for pedestrian and cyclists along the US 36 Interchange and Wadsworth in the city and county of Broomfield, $500,000 for construction of a climbing lane on Interstate 70 in Clear Creek County, $100,000 for property acquisition and renovation costs of a new facility for the National Sports Center for the Disabled (NSCD) located in the town of Winter Park.

Of course, I do not agree with all its priorities included in the legislation. I believe it was shortsighted to eliminate funding for Small Starts in the Department of Transportation (DOT) budget. This much needed program is designed to provide discretionary grant funding for public transportation projects that run along dedicated corridors or guideways. I am hopeful the Senate takes a different approach and provides funding for this vital program.

Additionally, with the increasing federal budget deficits caused by the recent recession, the costs of responding to terrorism and increasing homeland security, and the excessive and unbalanced tax cuts the Bush Administration has pushed through Congress I think the idea of eliminating a cost-of-living increase in Congressional salaries is worth considering.

I thought the House should have been able to have a separate vote on this increase, and voted against the restrictive procedure that prevented that. Unfortunately, I was in the minority on that vote.

I also supported a number of amendments to improve the legislation, including an increase in funding for High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program, the Section 8 Tenant-Based assistance and for the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) which improved the bill.

While the legislation is still not all that I had hoped for, it deserves support and I will vote for it and will hope that it is improved further as the legislative process continues.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of important taxpayer-protection provisions that are included in this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, in recent years the IRS has attempted to implement a new program under which it would contract with private companies to collect the taxes of thousands of Americans. In recognition of the inherent risks of such a plan, this legislation wisely prohibits the IRS from using fiscal year 2007 funds provided by this bill to implement or administer a private tax collection contracting program.

All of us want a system that efficiently collects federal taxes, but we cannot do it at the expense of taxpayers' rights or privacy. However, if the IRS were allowed to go forward with its plan to outsource its tax collection duties, millions of taxpayer files would be made available to private debt collection companies who would ''contact'' taxpayers and collect up to a 24 percent fee from such collections.

This type of incentive system on the part of the collectors would be ripe for abuse and harassment. It is why the IRS specifically prohibits its employees from being assigned quotas with regard to collection activities. It should come as no surprise that the private debt collection industry receives the greatest number of formal complaints as recorded by the Federal Trade Commission than any other business in the nation.

Past experience should also guide us in consideration of this initiative. In 1996, Congress approved a two year pilot program for just such a collection scheme. Not only were there multiple violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act by the private collection companies, but sensitive taxpayer data was not properly protected.After 12 months, the pilot program had cost the U.S. Treasury $17 million and Congress saw fit to cancel the remaining 12 month pilot.

Each year millions of Americans voluntarily disclose personal, sensitive information to the IRS with the expectation that it will be handled with the utmost discretion and protected from erroneous or deliberate disclosure outside of the IRS. Yet the IRS is now leading the effort to disclose this information to third party contractors who have demonstrated previously that they cannot adequately protect taxpayer information.

If the above facts do not cause you concern, imagine the response of your constituents when they learn that these contractors are not required to be American-based or staffed. In fact, foreign companies employing non-US. citizens can bid for this work. When American taxpayers understand that their personal information could potentially be put in the hands of foreign workers toiling in ''boiler room'' operations in foreign countries, they will rightly ask who supported such a risky and short-sighted scheme.

I can assure my colleagues that you will encounter some mighty unhappy constituents if they find their personal tax information in the hands of a third party overseas. Keep in mind, also, that the most susceptible individuals will be our home-bound seniors and busy single mothers who may have overlooked some aspect of their tax filing. Do we really want to sic commission-hungry tax collection agents on these individuals?

Speaking as a veteran, I recently learned that my personal data had been compromised through a theft. I do not want my personal tax data may end up in unknown hands in unknown places. This bill protects my data.

American citizens deserve to have their taxes collected by American public officials at the Treasury Department. I am glad that this legislation takes steps to ensure this will be the case.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my concerns and reservations about a particular matter included in the House Report (H. Rpt. 109–495) accompanying the bill, H.R. 5576, the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for fiscal year 2007.

Under the Safe Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users, Congress specifically authorized funding to be made available for the execution of the Federal commitment for transit new start projects. Currently, 18 transit new starts have Full Funding Grant Agreements (FFGA) from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). The FFGAs provide a commitment for the Federal share of the project and serve as a basis for local transit recipients to plan and advance badly needed transit projects that help serve the transportation needs of local and regional communities. Without the Federal commitment, many of these transit projects would not be built.

Unfortunately, the House Report directs the FTA to retain the final payment under the FFGA for one particular transit new start

project, the Tren Urbano project in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, until the Commonwealth and the project construction contractor resolve outstanding issues and reach a close-out agreement.

Mr. Chairman, the language directing FTA to retain funds authorized in SAFETEA–LU until a contract dispute is resolved by all parties is highly unusual and interjects the Federal Transit Administration in the midst of ongoing judicial proceedings. The Committee direction would have the effect of withholding a Federal commitment of funds that are not related to the amounts under dispute with the contractor of the system and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The Federal funds are not at risk. The amounts under discussion are related to the amounts contracted with local funds. Therefore, the FTA should release the amounts agreed to for the Tren Urbano project.

Based upon FTA's oversight and management reviews, Tren Urbano has received the support of FTA for the release of the remaining amounts that the project is entitled to receive. Unfortunately, the report language would preclude FTA from awarding the final payment for the Tren Urbano project.

Although the Tren Urbano project has encountered a number of construction and management missteps in constructing the project, the government has responded by correcting its management problems, overcoming delays, and safety concerns. To the credit of the Governor of Puerto Rico, our former colleague Anibal Acevedo-Villa, and his Secretary of Transportation, the concerns raised in an audit by the Inspector General and the requirements made by FTA have been fully addressed to the Administration's satisfaction. As a result, the project has recently celebrated its first anniversary with a passenger ridership of more than 17 million passengers, 35 percent over the estimated ridership levels. The turnaround of the project has resulted in an overwhelming transit success.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the unprecedented language that directs FT A to withhold the final full funding grant payment until both sides reach a close out agreement. Such direction may have the effect of further delaying the resolution of contract disputes. I believe this direction should be rejected by the Federal Transit Administration so that the Tren Urbano project may receive the full funding grant amounts that it is entitled to receive under its agreement with the Federal Transit Administration.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, in accordance with earmark reform proposals currently under consideration in the House and Senate, I would like to place into the RECORD a listing of Congressionally-directed projects in my home state of Idaho that are contained within the report to this bill. These are projects that I asked the Transportation, Treasury, and HUD Subcommittee to consider this year and I am grateful for their inclusion in this bill.

I'd like to take just a few minutes to describe why I supported these projects and why they are valuable to the nation and its taxpayers.

The bill contains $2,000,000 for the City of Rocks Back Country Byway in my Congressional District. This 16.7 mile long project is located on the popular City of Rocks Back Country Byway in Cassia County, Idaho and provides the only direct access to the City of Rocks National Reserve. When fully completed, the project will pave a 1.0 mile gravel segment, reconstruct 15.7 miles of deficient roadway, correct deteriorated road and slope conditions, provide a wider road with shoulders and guardrail, and improve the road's alignment by reducing the number and severity of sharp curves and steep grades. These improvements will increase safety for the driving public and provide safer access for bicycle and pedestrian traffic. These improvements will also significantly reduce the amount of ongoing maintenance required to keep the route usable.

This project was requested by the Idaho Transportation Department.

The report contains $500,000 for the I–84, US–93 Interchange project near Twin Falls. This is funding to improve an interchange on a segment of the Interstate Highway System. The project will realign and reconstruct the interchanges south of I–84 at US–93, provide a new grade over US–93, and remove the height-restricted structures which have previously necessitated a signalized intersection. These activities will relieve congestion caused by fast growth and increase safety in the city of Twin Falls.

This project was requested by the Idaho Transportation Department.

The report contains $4 million for the Idaho Transit Coalition's program to improve bus and bus facilities all across the state of Idaho. The funding will assist Ada County Highway District's Commuteride, Boise State University, the Coeur d'Alene Tribe, the City of Ketchum, the Ketchum/Sun Valley Transit Authority (KART), the City of Moscow, the City of Pocatello, the University of Idaho, and Valley Regional Transit. The majority of these projects are identified in the "Idaho Statewide Public Transportation Needs and Benefits Study" compiled by the Idaho Transportation Department in 1996 and subsequent local studies and plans. All projects are identified in the Transportation Improvement and the Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan. The current request represents only a small amount of what will be needed to maintain and expand Idaho's public transportation capital system to meet the demands of the State's rapidly growing population.

The funding was requested by the Idaho Transit Coalition.

The report contains $250,000 for the Magic Valley Boys and Girls Club in Buhl, Idaho. The funding will assist in building a Boys & Girls Club youth center in the town of Buhl, Idaho, which will serve over 800 children and teens annually from the communities of Buhl, Castleford, and Hagerman. This 7000 sq. ft. facility will be adjacent to an existing approximately 7000 sq. ft. gymnasium. These federal funds constitute only a small portion of the overall funding required for this project and will help leverage significant private sector donations.

The funding was requested by the Magic Valley Boys and Girls Club.

The report contains $400,000 for the community of Rexburg, Idaho's Greenways and River Corridor Improvement Project. This funding represents a very small portion of the overall funding for this project. The City of Rexburg itself has jump started the project with a Rexburg Redevelopment Agency infusion of $5,800,000. The funding will help develop public access to the riverfront through river trails, build and improve city streets and parking lots in the river corridor, and construct a public amphitheater.

The funding was requested by the City of Rexburg, Idaho.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide a list of Congressionally-directed projects in my region and, an explanation of my support for them.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I submit the following for the RECORD:

Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations, 2007 (H.R. 5576)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Office of the Secretary					
Salaries and expenses	84,052	92,742	92,558	+8,506	-184
Immediate Office of the Secretary	(2,176)	---	(2,255)	(+79)	(+2,255)
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary	(691)	---	(717)	(+26)	(+717)
Office of the General Counsel	(15,031)	---	(15,681)	(+650)	(+15,681)
Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy	(11,534)	---	(11,684)	(+150)	(+11,684)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs	(8,400)	---	(10,002)	(+1,602)	(+10,002)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs	(2,270)	---	(2,319)	(+49)	(+2,319)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	(21,811)	---	(25,108)	(+3,297)	(+25,108)
Office of Public Affairs	(1,891)	---	(1,932)	(+41)	(+1,932)
Executive Secretariat	(1,428)	---	(1,478)	(+50)	(+1,478)
Board of Contract Appeals	(690)	---	(707)	(+17)	(+707)
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization	(1,252)	---	(1,286)	(+34)	(+1,286)
Office of Intelligence and Security	(2,013)	---	(2,722)	(+709)	(+2,722)
Office of the Chief Information Officer	(11,776)	---	(12,281)	(+505)	(+12,281)
Office of emergency transportation	(3,089)	---	(4,386)	(+1,297)	(+4,386)
User fees	(-2,500)	---	---	(+2,500)	---
Spending of user fees	(2,500)	---	---	(-2,500)	---
Subtotal	(84,052)	(92,742)	(92,558)	(+8,506)	(-184)
Office of Civil Rights	8,465	8,821	8,821	+356	---
Rescission of excess compensation for air carriers	---	-50,000	-50,000	-50,000	---
Transportation planning, research, and development	14,850	8,910	13,000	-1,850	+4,090
Working capital fund	(118,014)	---	(120,000)	(+1,986)	(+120,000)
Minority business resource center program	891	891	891	---	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(18,367)	(18,367)	(18,367)	---	---
Minority business outreach	2,970	2,970	2,970	---	---
New headquarters building	49,500	59,400	---	-49,500	-59,400
Payments to air carriers (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	59,400	---	67,000	+7,600	+67,000
General Aviation and Fixed Based Operator Reimbursement (sec. 186)	16,830	---	---	-16,830	---
Total, Office of the Secretary	236,958	173,734	185,240	-51,718	+11,506
Federal Aviation Administration					
Operations	8,104,140	8,366,000	8,360,000	+255,860	-6,000
Air traffic organization	(6,562,700)	---	(6,698,728)	(+136,028)	(+6,698,728)
Aviation Safety	(948,957)	---	(997,718)	(+48,761)	(+997,718)
Commercial Space Transportation	(11,641)	---	(11,985)	(+344)	(+11,985)
Financial Services	(50,473)	---	(92,227)	(+41,754)	(+92,227)
Human Resource Management	(69,244)	---	(87,850)	(+18,606)	(+87,850)
Region and Center Operations	(149,237)	---	(272,821)	(+123,584)	(+272,821)
Staff Offices	(140,580)	---	(175,392)	(+34,812)	(+175,392)
Information Services	(35,751)	---	(36,779)	(+1,028)	(+36,779)
Flight Service Stations A-76 transition	(148,500)	---	---	(-148,500)	---
Undistributed reduction	---	---	(-14,000)	(-14,000)	(-14,000)
Subtotal	8,104,140	8,366,000	8,360,000	+255,860	-6,000
Facilities & equipment (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	2,514,600	2,503,000	3,110,000	+595,400	+607,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148)	40,600	---	---	-40,600	---
Research, engineering, and development (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)	136,620	130,000	134,000	-2,620	+4,000

Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations, 2007 (H.R. 5576)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(3,399,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,171,000)	(+772,000)	(+171,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(3,514,500)	(2,750,000)	(3,700,000)	(+185,500)	(+950,000)
Small community air service development program	(9,900)	---	(10,000)	(+100)	(+10,000)
Airport Cooperative Research Program	(9,900)	---	(10,000)	(+100)	(+10,000)
2007 F&E Pop-up contract authority	513,000	607,000	---	-513,000	-607,000
Rescission of contract authority (BY F&E Pop-up)	-513,000	-607,000	---	+513,000	+607,000
Rescission of contract authority (BY AIP)	-50,000	-950,000	---	+50,000	+950,000
Rescission of contract authority (prior yr Pop-up)	-469,000	-25,000	-25,000	+444,000	---
Subtotal	(2,995,500)	(1,775,000)	(3,675,000)	(+679,500)	(+1,900,000)
War risk insurance program extension	-80,000	---	-125,000	-45,000	-125,000
Total, Federal Aviation Administration	11,228,960	11,606,000	11,479,000	+250,040	-127,000
(Limitations on obligations)	(3,514,500)	(2,750,000)	(3,700,000)	(+185,500)	(+950,000)
Rescissions of contract authority	-1,032,000	-1,582,000	-25,000	+1,007,000	+1,557,000
Total budgetary resources	(13,711,460)	(12,774,000)	(15,154,000)	(+1,442,540)	(+2,380,000)
Federal Highway Administration					
Limitation on administrative expenses	(360,992)	(372,504)	(372,504)	(+11,512)	---
Federal-aid highways (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(36,032,344)	(39,086,000)	(39,086,465)	(+3,054,121)	(+465)
(Limitation on obligations)	(35,672,021)	(39,086,465)	(39,086,465)	(+3,414,444)	---
(Exempt contract authority)	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
(Transfer to NHTSA)	(-121,232)	---	---	(+121,232)	---
Rescission of contract authority (Hwy Trust Fund)	---	---	-107,423	-107,423	-107,423
Appalachian development highway system	19,800	---	---	-19,800	---
Emergency relief programs (Highway Trust Fund)					
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148)	2,750,000	---	---	-2,750,000	---
Rescission of contract authority (Hwy Trust Fund)	-1,999,999	---	-2,000,000	-1	-2,000,000
Rescission of contract authority (HTF)(P.L. 109-148)	-1,143,000	---	---	+1,143,000	---
Additional contract authority (sec. 112)	618,000	---	---	-618,000	---
TIFIA (rescission of contract authority)(sec. 125)	---	---	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000
Total, Federal Highway Administration	244,801	---	-2,207,423	-2,452,224	-2,207,423
(Limitations on obligations)	(35,672,021)	(39,086,465)	(39,086,465)	(+3,414,444)	---
(Transfer out)	(-121,232)	---	---	(+121,232)	---
(Exempt contract authority)	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
Rescissions	---	---	---	---	---
Rescissions of contract authority	-3,142,999	---	-2,207,423	+935,576	-2,207,423
Total budgetary resources	(33,146,790)	(39,825,465)	(37,618,042)	(+4,471,252)	(-2,207,423)
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration					
Motor carrier safety operations and programs (Highway Trust Fund)(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(213,000)	(223,000)	(223,000)	(+10,000)	---
(Limitation on obligations)	(210,870)	(223,000)	(223,000)	(+12,130)	---
National motor carrier safety program (Highway Trust					
Motor carrier safety grants (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(282,000)	(294,000)	(294,000)	(+12,000)	---
(Limitation on obligations)	(279,180)	(294,000)	(294,000)	(+14,820)	---
Total, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Admin	---	---	---	---	---
(Limitations on obligations)	(490,050)	(517,000)	(517,000)	(+26,950)	---
Total budgetary resources	(490,050)	(517,000)	(517,000)	(+26,950)	---
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration					
Operations and research (HTF)	---	---	122,000	+122,000	+122,000
Operations and research (Highway trust fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(110,000)	(227,250)	(107,750)	(-2,250)	(-119,500)
(Limitation on obligations)	(108,900)	(227,250)	(107,750)	(-1,150)	(-119,500)
(Transfer from FHWA)	(121,232)	---	---	(-121,232)	---
National Driver Register (Highway trust fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	---	---
(Limitation on obligations)	(3,960)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(+40)	---

Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations, 2007 (H.R. 5576)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Highway traffic safety grants (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(578,176)	(583,750)	(587,750)	(+9,574)	(+4,000)
(Limitation on obligations):					
Highway safety programs (Sec. 402)	(214,830)	(220,000)	(220,000)	(+5,170)	---
Occupant protection incentive grants (Sec. 405)	(24,750)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(+250)	---
Safety belt performance grants (Sec. 406)	(123,255)	(124,500)	(124,500)	(+1,245)	---
Alcohol-impaired driving countermeasures grants (Sec. 410)	(118,800)	(125,000)	(125,000)	(+6,200)	---
State traffic safety information system improvement grants (Sec. 408)	(34,155)	(34,500)	(34,500)	(+345)	---
High visibility enforcement	(28,710)	(25,000)	(29,000)	(+290)	(+4,000)
Child safety and booster seat grants	(5,940)	(6,000)	(6,000)	(+60)	---
Motorcyclist safety	(5,940)	(6,000)	(6,000)	(+60)	---
Grant administration	(16,014)	(17,750)	(17,750)	(+1,736)	---
Subtotal	(572,394)	(583,750)	(587,750)	(+15,356)	(+4,000)
Total, National Highway Traffic Safety Admin.	---	---	122,000	+122,000	+122,000
(Limitations on obligations)	(685,254)	(815,000)	(699,500)	(+14,246)	(-115,500)
(By transfer)	(121,232)	---	---	(-121,232)	---
Total budgetary resources	(806,486)	(815,000)	(821,500)	(+15,014)	(+6,500)
Federal Railroad Administration					
Safety and operations	144,490	150,578	150,083	+5,593	-495
Railroad research and development	54,524	34,650	34,650	-19,874	---
Alaska Railroad rehabilitation	9,900	---	---	-9,900	---
National Railroad Passenger Corporation					
Operating subsidy grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation	490,050	---	---	-490,050	---
Capital grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation	772,200	500,000	500,000	-272,200	---
Rescission (P.L. 109-148)	-8,300	---	---	+8,300	---
Efficiency incentive grants to National Railroad Passenger Corporation	39,600	400,000	400,000	+360,400	---
Total, National Railroad Passenger Corporation	1,293,550	900,000	900,000	-393,550	---
Total, Federal Railroad Administration	1,510,764	1,085,228	1,084,733	-426,031	-495
Federal Transit Administration					
Administrative expenses, general fund	79,200	85,000	85,000	+5,800	---
Office of the Administrator	(916)	---	(1,063)	(+147)	(+1,063)
Office of Chief Counsel	(4,017)	---	(4,420)	(+403)	(+4,420)
Office of Civil Rights	(3,121)	---	(3,053)	(-68)	(+3,053)
Office of Communications and Congressional Affairs	(1,345)	---	(1,432)	(+87)	(+1,432)
Office of Budget and Policy	(8,646)	---	(8,993)	(+347)	(+8,993)
Office of Planning	(4,086)	---	(4,643)	(+557)	(+4,643)
Office of Program Management	(7,906)	---	(8,091)	(+185)	(+8,091)
Office of Demonstration and Innovation	(4,716)	---	(4,768)	(+52)	(+4,768)
Office of Administration	(7,252)	---	(7,218)	(-34)	(+7,218)
Central Account	(16,648)	---	(17,223)	(+575)	(+17,223)
Regional offices	(20,546)	---	(24,096)	(+3,550)	(+24,096)
Subtotal	(79,200)	(85,000)	(85,000)	(+5,800)	---
Formula and Bus Grants (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account)(limitation on obligations)	(6,910,132)	(7,262,775)	(7,262,775)	(+352,643)	---
Formula and Bus Grants (rescission)	---	-28,661	-28,661	-28,661	---
Subtotal	(6,910,132)	(7,234,114)	(7,234,114)	(+323,982)	---

Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations, 2007 (H.R. 5576)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Research and University Research Centers	74,448	61,000	65,000	-9,448	+4,000
Flexible funding	---	---	---	---	---
Trust fund share of expenses(Mass Transit Account,HTF) (liquidation of contract authorization)	(6,910,132)	(7,262,775)	(7,262,775)	(+352,643)	---
Capital investment grants	1,440,682	1,466,000	1,566,000	+125,318	+100,000
Small stands	---	---	-17,760	-17,760	-17,760
Subtotal	(1,440,682)	(1,466,000)	(1,548,240)	(+107,558)	(+82,240)
Total, Federal Transit Administration	1,594,330	1,583,339	1,669,579	+75,249	+86,240
(Limitations on obligations)	(6,910,132)	(7,262,775)	(7,262,775)	(+352,643)	---
Total budgetary resources	(8,504,462)	(8,846,114)	(8,932,354)	(+427,892)	(+86,240)
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation					
Operations and maintenance (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund)	16,121	8,000	17,425	+1,304	+9,425
Maritime Administration					
Maritime security program	154,440	154,440	154,440	---	---
Operations and training	121,027	115,830	116,442	-4,585	+612
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148)	7,500	---	---	-7,500	---
Ship disposal	20,790	25,740	25,740	+4,950	---
Vessel operations revolving fund	---	---	---	---	---
Maritime Guaranteed Loan (Title XI) Program Account:					
Administrative expenses	4,085	3,317	3,317	-768	---
Rescission	---	-2,000	-2,000	-2,000	---
National defense tank vessel program (rescission)	---	-74,400	-74,400	-74,400	---
Ship construction (rescission)	-2,071	---	---	+2,071	---
Total, Maritime Administration	305,771	222,927	223,539	-82,232	+612
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration					
Hazardous materials safety	25,877	27,225	27,225	+1,348	---
Administrative expenses	16,070	17,082	17,082	+1,012	---
Pipeline Safety Fund	639	639	639	---	---
Subtotal	16,709	17,721	17,721	+1,012	---
Pipeline safety:					
Pipeline Safety Fund	57,430	56,925	56,925	-505	---
Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund	14,850	18,810	18,810	+3,960	---
Subtotal	72,280	75,735	75,735	+3,455	---
Emergency preparedness grants:					
Emergency preparedness fund	198	198	198	---	---
Limitation on emergency preparedness fund	(14,157)	(28,328)	(28,328)	(+14,171)	---
Total, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration	115,064	120,879	120,879	+5,815	---
Research and Innovative Technology Administration					
Research and development	5,716	8,217	6,367	+651	-1,850
Office of Inspector General					
Salaries and expenses	61,874	64,143	64,143	+2,269	---

Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations, 2007 (H.R. 5576)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Surface Transportation Board					
Salaries and expenses	26,186	22,925	25,618	-568	+2,693
Offsetting collections	-1,250	-1,250	-1,250	---	---
Total, Surface Transportation Board	24,936	21,675	24,368	-568	+2,693
Total, title I, Department of Transportation	14,304,995	13,262,142	12,714,850	-1,590,145	-547,292
Appropriations	(15,692,265)	(14,999,203)	(15,102,334)	(-589,931)	(+103,131)
Rescissions	(-10,371)	(-155,061)	(-155,061)	(-144,690)	---
Rescission of contract authority	(-4,174,999)	(-1,582,000)	(-2,232,423)	(+1,942,576)	(-650,423)
Emergency appropriations	(2,798,100)	---	---	(-2,798,100)	---
Offsetting collections	---	---	---	---	---
(Limitations on obligations)	(47,271,957)	(50,431,240)	(51,265,740)	(+3,993,783)	(+834,500)
(Exempt contract authority)	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
(By transfer)	(121,232)	---	---	(-121,232)	---
(Transfer out)	(-121,232)	---	---	(+121,232)	---
Total budgetary resources	(62,315,952)	(64,432,382)	(64,719,590)	(+2,403,638)	(+287,208)
Transportation discretionary total	14,304,995	13,262,142	12,714,850	-1,590,145	-547,292
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY					
Departmental Offices					
Salaries and expenses	194,626	223,874	223,786	+29,160	-88
Executive direction	(8,556)	(17,501)	(8,760)	(+204)	(-8,741)
General Counsel	(7,773)	---	(8,741)	(+968)	(+8,741)
Economic policies and and programs	(31,691)	(41,947)	(41,947)	(+10,256)	---
Financial policies and programs	(26,308)	(25,336)	(27,086)	(+778)	(+1,750)
Terrorism and Financial Intelligence	(39,540)	(45,401)	(45,401)	(+5,861)	---
Treasury wide management	(16,675)	(20,372)	(18,534)	(+1,859)	(-1,838)
Administration	(63,094)	(73,317)	(73,317)	(+10,223)	---
Currency manipulation	(990)	---	---	(-990)	---
Subtotal	(194,627)	(223,874)	(223,786)	(+29,159)	(-88)
Department-wide systems and capital investments programs	24,168	34,032	34,032	+9,864	---
Office of Inspector General	16,830	17,352	17,352	+522	---
Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration	131,953	136,469	136,469	+4,516	---
Air transportation stabilization program account	2,723	---	---	-2,723	---
Community development financial institutions fund program account	54,450	7,821	40,000	-14,450	+32,179
Treasury building and annex repair and restoration	9,900	---	---	-9,900	---
Financial Crimes Enforcement Network	72,894	89,794	84,066	+11,172	-5,728
Total, Departmental Offices	507,544	509,342	535,705	+28,161	+26,363
Financial Management Service	233,881	233,654	233,654	-227	---
Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau:					
Salaries and expenses	90,215	63,964	92,604	+2,389	+28,640
Spending from proposed user fees	---	28,640	---	---	-28,640
Subtotal	90,215	92,604	92,604	+2,389	---
Bureau of the Public Debt	175,154	177,789	177,789	+2,635	---
Payment of government losses in shipment	1,000	500	500	-500	---
Total, Dept. of Treasury, non-IRS	1,007,794	1,013,889	1,040,252	+32,458	+26,363
Internal Revenue Service					
Processing, assistance, and management	4,095,212	4,045,122	---	-4,095,212	-4,045,122
Rescission	-20,000	---	---	+20,000	---
Taxpayer services	---	---	2,059,151	+2,059,151	+2,059,151
Tax law enforcement	4,678,498	4,762,327	---	-4,678,498	-4,762,327

Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations, 2007 (H.R. 5576)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Enforcement	---	---	4,757,126	+4,757,126	+4,757,126
Information systems	1,582,977	1,602,232	---	-1,582,977	-1,602,232
Operations support	---	---	3,438,404	+3,438,404	+3,438,404
Business systems modernization	197,010	167,310	212,310	+15,300	+45,000
Health Insurance Tax Credit Administration	20,008	14,846	14,846	-5,162	---
Rescission	-9,000	---	---	+9,000	---
Total, Internal Revenue Service	10,544,705	10,591,837	10,481,837	-62,868	-110,000
Total, title II, Department of the Treasury	11,552,499	11,605,726	11,522,089	-30,410	-83,637
Appropriations	(11,581,499)	(11,605,726)	(11,522,089)	(-59,410)	(-83,637)
Rescissions	(-29,000)	---	---	(+29,000)	---
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
Public and Indian Housing					
Tenant-based Rental Assistance:					
Renewals	13,948,858	14,436,200	14,436,200	+487,342	---
Tenant protection vouchers	178,200	149,300	149,300	-28,900	---
Family self-sufficiency coordinators	47,520	47,500	47,500	-20	---
Administrative fees	1,237,500	1,281,100	1,137,500	-100,000	-143,600
Working capital fund	5,841	5,900	5,900	+59	---
Subtotal	15,417,919	15,920,000	15,776,400	+358,481	-143,600
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148)	390,300	---	---	-390,300	---
Advance appropriations	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	---	---
Less appropriations from prior year advances	-4,200,000	-4,200,000	-4,200,000	---	---
Total, Tenant-based rental assistance	15,808,219	15,920,000	15,776,400	-31,819	-143,600
Project-based rental assistance:					
Renewals	4,890,303	5,526,240	5,326,240	+435,937	-200,000
Contract administrators	145,728	145,500	145,500	-228	---
Working capital fund	1,386	3,960	3,960	+2,574	---
Total, Project-based rental assistance	5,037,417	5,675,700	5,475,700	+438,283	-200,000
Public Housing Capital Fund	2,438,964	2,178,000	2,178,000	-260,964	---
Public Housing Operating Fund	3,564,000	3,564,000	3,564,000	---	---
Revitalization of severely distressed public housing	99,000	---	---	-99,000	---
Native American housing block grants	623,700	625,680	625,680	+1,980	---
Indian housing loan guarantee fund program account	3,960	5,940	3,960	---	-1,980
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(116,276)	(251,000)	(116,276)	---	(-134,724)
Native Hawaiian housing block grant	8,727	5,940	8,815	+88	+2,875
Native Hawaiian loan guarantee fund program account	891	1,010	1,010	+119	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(35,714)	(43,000)	(43,000)	(+7,286)	---
Total, Public and Indian Housing	27,584,878	27,976,270	27,633,565	+48,687	-342,705
Community Planning and Development					
Housing opportunities for persons with AIDS	286,110	300,100	300,100	+13,990	---
Rural housing and economic development	16,830	---	---	-16,830	---
Community development fund	4,177,800	3,032,000	4,200,000	+22,200	+1,168,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L.109-148)	11,500,000	---	---	-11,500,000	---
Section 108 loan guarantees:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(137,500)	---	---	(-137,500)	---
Credit subsidy	2,970	---	---	-2,970	---
Administrative expenses	743	---	---	-743	---
Brownfields redevelopment	9,900	---	---	-9,900	---
HOME investment partnerships program	1,757,250	1,916,640	1,916,640	+159,390	---
Homeless assistance grants	1,326,600	1,535,990	1,535,990	+209,390	---
Self-help homeownership opportunity program	60,390	39,700	60,390	---	+20,690
Total, Community Planning and Development	19,138,593	6,824,430	8,013,120	-11,125,473	+1,188,690

Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations, 2007 (H.R. 5576)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Housing Programs					
Housing for the elderly	734,580	545,490	734,580	---	+189,090
Housing for persons with disabilities	236,610	118,800	236,610	---	+117,810
Housing counseling assistance	---	44,550	---	---	-44,550
Manufactured housing fees trust fund	13,000	16,000	16,000	+3,000	---
Offsetting collections	-13,000	-13,000	-13,000	---	---
Offsetting collections (leg proposal)	---	-3,000	-3,000	-3,000	---
Rental housing assistance	26,136	24,750	24,750	-1,386	---
Total, Housing Programs	997,326	733,590	995,940	-1,386	+262,350
Federal Housing Administration					
FHA - Mutual mortgage insurance program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(185,000,000)	(185,000,000)	(185,000,000)	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses	351,450	351,450	351,450	---	---
Offsetting receipts	-1,309,000	-176,000	-176,000	+1,133,000	---
Move prog to gen/spec risk (legislative proposal)	---	-358,000	---	---	+358,000
Administrative contract expenses	61,974	62,400	52,400	-9,574	-10,000
Additional contract expenses	1,000	---	---	-1,000	---
FHA - General and special risk program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses	229,086	229,086	229,086	---	---
Offsetting receipts	-339,000	-476,000	-476,000	-137,000	---
Credit subsidy	8,712	8,600	8,600	-112	---
Non-overhead administrative expenses	71,181	78,111	72,778	+1,597	-5,333
Additional contract expenses	4,000	4,000	---	-4,000	-4,000
Move programs from MMI (leg proposal)	---	358,000	---	---	-358,000
FHA program modernization and reform (Sec. 325)	---	---	-197,000	-197,000	-197,000
Total, Federal Housing Administration	-920,597	81,647	-134,686	+785,911	-216,333
Government National Mortgage Association (GNMA)					
Guarantees of mortgage-backed securities loan guarantee program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(200,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(-100,000,000)	---
Administrative expenses	10,700	10,700	10,700	---	---
Administrative expenses (legislative proposal)	---	43,000	---	---	-43,000
Offsetting receipts	-368,000	-181,000	-181,000	+187,000	---
Offsetting receipts (legislative proposal)	---	-43,000	---	---	+43,000
Additional contract expenses	---	7,000	---	---	-7,000
Total, Gov't National Mortgage Association	-357,300	-163,300	-170,300	+187,000	-7,000
Policy Development and Research					
Research and technology	55,787	68,360	55,787	---	-12,573
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity					
Fair housing activities	45,540	44,550	44,550	-990	---
Office of Lead Hazard Control					
Lead hazard reduction	150,480	114,840	114,840	-35,640	---
Management and Administration					
Salaries and expenses	573,210	594,000	573,210	---	-20,790
Fannie Mae/Freddie Mac fee proposal	---	-4,000	---	---	+4,000
Transfer from:					
Limitation on FHA corporate funds	(562,400)	(556,776)	(556,776)	(-5,624)	---
GNMA	(10,700)	(10,593)	(10,700)	---	(+107)
Community Development Loan Guarantees Program	(750)	---	---	(-750)	---
Native American Housing Block Grants	(150)	(147,500)	(149)	(-1)	(-147,351)

Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations, 2007 (H.R. 5576)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund Program....	(250)	(248)	(248)	(-2)	---
Native Hawaiian Housing Loan Guarantees.....	(35)	(35)	(35)	---	---
Subtotal.....	(1,147,495)	(1,305,152)	(1,141,118)	(-6,377)	(-164,034)
Working capital fund.....	195,030	219,780	100,000	-95,030	-119,780
Office of Inspector General.....	81,180	83,240	83,240	+2,060	---
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds)..	(23,760)	(23,760)	(23,760)	---	---
Subtotal.....	(104,940)	(107,000)	(107,000)	(+2,060)	---
Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight.....	60,000	62,000	62,000	+2,000	---
Offsetting receipts.....	-60,000	-62,000	-62,000	-2,000	---
Total, Management and Administration.....	849,420	893,020	756,450	-92,970	-136,570
Rescissions:					
Housing certificate fund.....	-2,050,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000	+50,000	---
Revitalization of severely distressed public housing.....	---	-99,000	---	---	+99,000
Brownfields Redevelopment.....	-10,000	---	---	+10,000	---
Community Development Fund.....	---	-356,400	---	---	+356,400
Subtotal.....	-2,060,000	-2,455,400	-2,000,000	+60,000	+455,400
Total, title III, Department of Housing and Urban Development.....	45,484,127	34,118,007	35,309,266	-10,174,861	+1,191,259
Appropriations.....	(33,542,827)	(33,685,407)	(34,217,266)	(+674,439)	(+531,859)
Rescissions.....	(-2,060,000)	(-2,455,400)	(-2,000,000)	(+60,000)	(+455,400)
Advance appropriations.....	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	---	---
Emergency appropriations.....	(11,890,300)	---	---	(-11,890,300)	---
Offsetting receipts.....	(-2,016,000)	(-1,234,000)	(-1,030,000)	(+986,000)	(+204,000)
Offsetting collections.....	(-73,000)	(-78,000)	(-78,000)	(-5,000)	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	---	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(420,289,490)	(320,294,000)	(320,159,276)	(-100,130,214)	(-134,724)
(Limitation on corporate funds).....	(598,045)	(738,912)	(591,668)	(-6,377)	(-147,244)
TITLE IV - THE JUDICIARY					
Supreme Court of the United States					
Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries of justices.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	---	---
Other salaries and expenses.....	58,143	61,405	61,405	+3,262	---
Subtotal.....	60,143	63,405	63,405	+3,262	---
Care of the building and grounds.....	5,568	12,959	12,959	+7,391	---
Total, Supreme Court of the United States.....	65,711	76,364	76,364	+10,653	---
United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit					
Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries of judges.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	---	---
Other salaries and expenses.....	21,780	24,300	24,000	+2,220	-300
Total, US Court of Appeals for the Fed Circuit..	23,780	26,300	26,000	+2,220	-300
United States Court of International Trade					
Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries of judges.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	---	---
Other salaries and expenses.....	13,345	14,182	14,182	+837	---
Total, US Court of International Trade.....	15,345	16,182	16,182	+837	---

Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations, 2007 (H.R. 5576)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services					
Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries of judges and bankruptcy judges	305,312	316,000	316,000	+10,688	---
Judges COLA	4,950	5,000	---	-4,950	-5,000
Other salaries and expenses	3,998,083	4,366,244	4,240,114	+242,031	-126,130
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148)	18,000	---	---	-18,000	---
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	4,326,345	4,687,244	4,556,114	+229,769	-131,130
Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund	3,795	3,952	3,952	+157	---
Defender services	709,830	803,879	750,033	+40,203	-53,846
Fees of jurors and commissioners	60,705	63,079	63,079	+2,374	---
Court security	368,280	410,334	400,334	+32,054	-10,000
Total, Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services	5,468,955	5,968,488	5,773,512	+304,557	-194,976
Administrative Office of the United States Courts					
Salaries and expenses	69,559	75,333	73,800	+4,241	-1,533
Federal Judicial Center					
Salaries and expenses	22,127	23,787	23,500	+1,373	-287
Judicial Retirement Funds					
Payment to judiciary trust funds	40,600	58,300	58,300	+17,700	---
United States Sentencing Commission					
Salaries and expenses	14,256	15,740	15,500	+1,244	-240
Total, title IV, the Judiciary	5,720,333	6,260,494	6,063,158	+342,825	-197,336
Mandatory appropriations	(351,912)	(380,300)	(380,300)	(+28,388)	---
Discretionary appropriations	(5,368,421)	(5,880,194)	(5,682,858)	(+314,437)	(-197,336)
TITLE V - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA					
FEDERAL FUNDS					
Federal payment for Resident Tuition Support	32,868	35,100	35,100	+2,232	---
Federal payment for Emergency Planning and Security Costs in the District of Columbia	13,365	8,533	8,533	-4,832	---
Federal payment to the District of Columbia Courts	216,723	196,629	219,629	+2,906	+23,000
Defender Services in District of Columbia Courts	43,560	43,475	43,475	-85	---
Federal payment to the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia	169,839	181,653	181,653	+11,814	---
Federal payment to the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia	29,535	32,710	32,710	+3,175	---
Federal payment to the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority	6,930	7,000	7,000	+70	---
Federal payment for the Anacostia Waterfront Initiative	2,970	---	---	-2,970	---
Federal payment to the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council	1,287	1,300	1,300	+13	---
Federal payment for Transportation Assistance	990	---	---	-990	---
Federal payment for Foster Care Improvements in the District of Columbia	1,980	---	---	-1,980	---
Federal payment to the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia	28,908	---	5,000	-23,908	+5,000
Federal payment for School Improvement	39,600	40,800	40,800	+1,200	---
Federal payment for Bioterrorism and Forensics Labs	4,950	---	---	-4,950	---
Federal payment for the National Guard Youth Challenge in the District of Columbia	495	---	---	-495	---
Federal payment for Marriage Development Accounts	2,970	---	---	-2,970	---

Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations, 2007 (H.R. 5576)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Federal payment for Navy Yard Metro Station	---	20,000	---	---	-20,000
Federal payment for Central Library/branch locations	---	30,000	---	---	-30,000
Total, Title V, District of Columbia	596,970	597,200	575,200	-21,770	-22,000
TITLE VI - EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
The White House					
Salaries and expenses	---	184,252	---	---	-184,252
Compensation of the President and the White House Office:					
Compensation of the President	450	---	450	---	+450
Salaries and expenses	53,292	---	51,952	-1,340	+51,952
Executive Residence at the White House:					
Operating expenses	12,312	---	12,041	-271	+12,041
White House repair and restoration	1,683	---	1,600	-83	+1,600
Council of Economic Advisers	4,000	---	4,002	+2	+4,002
Office of Policy Development	3,465	---	3,385	-80	+3,385
National Security Council	8,618	---	8,405	-213	+8,405
Office of Administration	88,429	---	91,393	+2,964	+91,393
Total, The White House	172,249	184,252	173,228	+979	-11,024
Office of Management and Budget	76,161	68,780	76,185	+24	+7,405
Office of National Drug Control Policy	26,639	23,309	26,928	+289	+3,619
Federal Drug Control Programs					
High intensity drug trafficking areas program	224,730	---	227,000	+2,270	+227,000
Other Federal drug control programs	192,951	212,160	194,000	+1,049	-18,160
Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center	29,700	9,600	19,600	-10,100	+10,000
Total, Federal Drug Control Programs	447,381	221,760	440,600	-6,781	+218,840
Unanticipated needs	990	11,789	1,000	+10	-10,789
Unanticipated Needs for Natural Disasters (emerg)	---	-11,789	---	---	+11,789
Special Assistance to the President	4,410	4,352	4,352	-58	---
Official Residence of the Vice President: Operating expenses	322	317	317	-5	---
Total, title VI, Executive Office of the President and Funds Appropriated to the President	728,152	502,770	722,610	-5,542	+219,840
TITLE VII - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board	5,882	5,957	5,957	+75	---
Consumer Product Safety Commission	62,370	62,370	62,370	---	---
Election Assistance Commission	14,058	16,908	16,908	+2,850	---
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation: Office of Inspector General (transfer)	(30,690)	(26,256)	(26,256)	(-4,434)	---
Federal Election Commission	54,153	57,138	57,138	+2,985	---
Federal Labor Relations Authority	25,213	25,218	25,218	+5	---
Federal Maritime Commission	20,294	21,474	21,474	+1,180	---
General Services Administration					
Federal Buildings Fund					
Appropriations	---	(243,025)	---	---	(-243,025)
Limitations on availability of revenue:					
Construction and acquisition of facilities	792,056	690,095	383,956	-408,100	-306,139
Repairs and alterations	861,376	866,194	866,194	+4,818	---
Installment acquisition payments	168,180	163,999	163,999	-4,181	---
Rental of space	4,046,031	4,322,548	4,322,548	+276,517	---

Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations, 2007 (H.R. 5576)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Building operations	1,885,102	2,003,830	2,003,830	+118,728	---
Subtotal	7,752,745	8,046,666	7,740,527	-12,218	-306,139
Repayment of debt	40,000	41,000	41,000	+1,000	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148)	38,000	---	---	-38,000	---
Rental income to fund	-7,808,000	-7,844,641	-7,844,641	-36,641	---
Total, Federal Buildings Fund	22,745	243,025	-63,114	-85,859	-306,139
Government-wide policy	52,268	52,550	52,550	+282	---
Operating expenses	98,891	83,032	83,032	-15,859	---
Office of Inspector General	42,976	44,312	44,312	+1,336	---
Electronic Government Fund	2,970	5,000	3,000	+30	-2,000
Allowances and Office Staff for Former Presidents	2,922	3,030	3,030	+108	---
Federal Citizen Information Center Fund	14,850	16,866	16,866	+2,016	---
Total, General Services Administration	237,622	447,815	139,676	-97,946	-308,139
Merit Systems Protection Board					
Salaries and expenses	35,244	36,531	36,531	+1,287	---
Limitation on administrative expenses	2,579	2,579	2,579	---	---
Total, Merit Systems Protection Board	37,823	39,110	39,110	+1,287	---
Morris K. Udall Foundation					
Morris K. Udall Trust Fund	1,980	---	2,000	+20	+2,000
Environmental Dispute Resolution Fund	1,881	693	2,000	+119	+1,307
Total, Morris K. Udall Foundation	3,861	693	4,000	+139	+3,307
National Archives and Records Administration					
Operating expenses	280,215	289,605	289,605	+9,390	---
Electronic records archive	37,535	45,455	45,455	+7,920	---
Reduction of debt	-8,488	-10,026	-10,026	-1,538	---
Repairs and restoration	9,585	13,020	13,020	+3,435	---
National Historical Publications and Records Commission: Grants program	7,425	---	7,500	+75	+7,500
Total, National Archives and Records Admin	326,272	338,054	345,554	+19,282	+7,500
National Credit Union Administration:					
Central liquidity facility:					
(Limitation on direct loans)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	---	---
(Limitation on admin expenses, corporate funds)	(323)	(331)	(331)	(+8)	---
Community development revolving loan fund	941	941	941	---	---
National Transportation Safety Board:					
Salaries and expenses	75,933	79,594	81,594	+5,661	+2,000
Rescission of unobligated balances	-1,000	-1,664	-1,664	-664	---
Emergency Fund (rescission)	---	-1,998	---	---	+1,998
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	116,820	119,790	119,790	+2,970	---
Office of Government Ethics	11,037	11,489	11,489	+452	---
Office of Personnel Management					
Salaries and expenses	121,296	111,095	111,095	-10,201	---
Limitation on administrative expenses	99,017	126,908	100,178	+1,161	-26,730
Office of Inspector General	2,050	1,598	1,598	-452	---
Limitation on administrative expenses	16,166	16,166	16,166	---	---
Govt Payment for Annuitants, Employees Health Benefits	8,393,000	8,780,260	8,780,260	+387,260	---
Govt Payment for Annuitants, Employee Life Insurance	36,000	39,000	39,000	+3,000	---
Payment to Civil Svc Retirement and Disability Fund	10,072,000	10,532,000	10,532,000	+460,000	---
Total, Office of Personnel Management	18,739,529	19,607,027	19,580,297	+840,768	-26,730
Office of Special Counsel	15,172	15,937	15,937	+765	---
Selective Service System	24,750	24,255	24,255	-495	---
United States Interagency Council on Homelessness	1,782	2,000	2,000	+218	---

Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations, 2007 (H.R. 5576)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
United States Postal Service					
Payment to the Postal Service Fund	42,917	---	29,000	-13,917	+29,000
Appropriations available from prior year advances	61,092	73,000	73,000	+11,908	---
Advance appropriations	73,000	79,915	79,915	+6,915	---
Less appropriations from prior year advances	-61,092	-73,000	-73,000	-11,908	---
Total, United States Postal Service	115,917	79,915	108,915	-7,002	+29,000
United States Tax Court	47,518	47,110	47,110	-408	---
Total, title VII, Independent Agencies	19,935,947	20,999,133	20,708,069	+772,122	-291,064
Appropriations	(19,825,947)	(20,922,880)	(20,629,818)	(+803,871)	(-293,062)
Rescissions	(-1,000)	(-3,662)	(-1,664)	(-664)	(+1,998)
Advance appropriations	(73,000)	(79,915)	(79,915)	(+6,915)	---
Emergency appropriations	(38,000)	---	---	(-38,000)	---
(By transfer)	(30,690)	(26,256)	(26,256)	(-4,434)	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	---	---
(Limitation on corporate funds)	(323)	(331)	(331)	(+8)	---
Title VIII - General Provisions, This Bill					
Scoring adjustment (for 1% ATB rescission)	-4,707	---	---	+4,707	---
Fed Hwys - addl contract authority (1% rescission)	-6,000	---	---	+6,000	---
Total, General provisions, This Bill	-10,707	---	---	+10,707	---
Grand total (net)	98,312,316	87,345,472	87,615,242	-10,697,074	+269,770
Appropriations	(87,669,993)	(88,585,469)	(88,832,475)	(+1,162,482)	(+247,006)
Emergency appropriations	(14,744,400)	(-11,789)	---	(-14,744,400)	(+11,789)
Offsetting collections	(-73,000)	(-78,000)	(-78,000)	(-5,000)	---
Rescissions	(-2,111,078)	(-2,614,123)	(-2,156,725)	(-45,647)	(+457,398)
Rescission of contract authority	(-4,174,999)	(-1,582,000)	(-2,232,423)	(+1,942,576)	(-650,423)
Negative subsidy receipts	(-2,016,000)	(-1,234,000)	(-1,030,000)	(+986,000)	(+204,000)
Advance appropriations	(4,273,000)	(4,279,915)	(4,279,915)	(+6,915)	---
(Limitation on obligations)	(47,271,957)	(50,431,240)	(51,265,740)	(+3,993,783)	(+834,500)
(Exempt contract authority)	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
(By transfer)	(151,922)	(26,256)	(26,256)	(-125,666)	---
(Transfer out)	(-121,232)	---	---	(+121,232)	---
Total budgetary resources	(146,323,273)	(138,515,712)	(139,619,982)	(-6,703,291)	(+1,104,270)
Discretionary total	79,457,954	67,613,412	67,882,732	-11,575,222	+269,320

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BASS) having assumed the chair, Mr. DREIER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5576) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 865, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 406, noes 22, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 286]

YEAS—406

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—22

Capuano
Chabot
Cooper
Deal (GA)
English (PA)
Flake
Franks (AZ)
Green (WI)
Hefley
Hensarling
Matheson
Obey
Otter
Paul
Pence
Pitts
Ryan (WI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Thornberry

NOT VOTING—4

Lewis (CA)
Miller (MI)
Rothman
Sessions

□ 1745

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 5576, TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 5576, the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections and conforming changes to the bill.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2048

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2048.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALEXANDER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EMANUEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IRAQ DEBATE

Mr. DEFAZIO. I ask unanimous consent to take the time of Mr. EMANUEL.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has shirked its constitutional duties when it comes to the issue of Iraq.

The most solemn of duties that this body can undertake is the declaration of war, reserved to the United States Congress. Now, in the case of Afghanistan, the known perpetrators of the 9/11 attacks, Osama bin Laden and his collaborators in the Taliban, this Congress did act, with near unanimity. One person dissented. And we passed a resolution that was compliant with the War Powers Act and the Constitution of the United States to authorize an attack on Iraq and others who aided and abetted in the 9/11 attacks.

Now, if George Bush had had proof or had really thought that Saddam Hussein and Iraq were involved in 9/11, he would have needed no further authority. But, clearly, he had no proof, and he couldn't make the case. But he, nonetheless, wanted to attack Iraq. And Congress, reaching a new low point here, in my opinion unconstitutionally, vaguely delegated its solemn duties in the case of the making of war to the President.

Now, I don't believe that Congress can do that, but we did, and the President then, some 5 months later, used that very broad grant of authority to preemptively attack Iraq, ostensibly to remove weapons of mass destruction and the threat of Saddam Hussein, which later morphed into connections to 9/11, which later morphed into any number of other things, and which finally became we went into Iraq to bring freedom and democracy.

Now, since that time, this Congress, this Republican-led Congress, has refused to conduct any meaningful oversight of what happened about the distortion or the misuse of intelligence, about the huge scandals surrounding the more than $10 billion which has disappeared in the so-called reconstruction effort or the actual conduct of the war itself, the unbelievable incompetence of Donald Rumsfeld and his cronies, and the impact on our troops in the military. Not one meaningful hearing. No debates here on the floor of the House.

So, finally, the Republican leadership says, well, we are going to have a meaningful debate. Now, let's see what they mean by meaningful debate. Tomorrow, the House of Representatives will take up a bunch of time, that is good, at least we are going to discuss it on the floor, but it will be to debate a nonbinding resolution; that is, something which has no force of law and no authority. It is a sense of the United States Congress.

And if you read that sense of Congress, you will find a nonbinding resolution which will not be amendable. No Democratic alternative or substitute will be allowed. What the Republicans wrote in secret will be voted on here on the floor of the House. That is it, up or down. This resolution, if you vote for it, is a vote for the status quo. It is a vote for staying in Iraq indefinitely, perhaps a decade or longer. It is to continue the current policies with no end in sight.

On March 21, President Bush himself even said that the question of bringing home U.S. troops from Iraq will be decided by future Presidents. Future Presidents. Remember, unfortunately, he still will be President until 2 years from last January. Now, that is a pretty extraordinary statement for the President to make.

Now, I wish that the Republican leadership really wanted to have a full and fair debate. They could at least allow us to have and debate an alternative. I am a member of the Out of Iraq Caucus. I am a cosponsor of Representative JACK MURTHA's legislation, legislation that would lead to a thoughtful and appropriate redeployment of our troops, and would also say that we would be ready should they need to reintervene in a crisis situation in Iraq. But what it would do is get us out of the business of day-to-day getting between the Shiias, the Kurds, and the Sunnis.

Now, Bush administration said, well, we never could have predicted the Shiias, the Sunnis, and the Kurds wouldn't get along. Rummy said they would welcome us like liberators, with flowers and stuff. He just ignored the last 1,400 years of history, that is all. He also ignored the State Department and the intelligence agencies, other than the little select group he had who said the same thing.

And now, I believe that the Shiias, the Kurds, and the Sunnis, and many others, will not meaningfully move to share power, get their act together and develop a national government as long as we are staying forever, which is what the President and what this resolution says. So I believe that if we go down the path of adopting this resolution that there will be Members of Congress debating this issue years and years from today about what is the U.S. future in Iraq.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IMMIGRATION

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consume the time of Mr. JONES.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, immigration has been the number one concern of many Americans in recent months. The House passed a bill last December which dealt mostly with tough border security. It provided for more Border Control agents, a 700-mile fence, different penalties for illegally entering the U.S., and substantial penalties for employers who employ illegal immigrants.

The Senate, more recently, passed a bill with tight border security but also had language which addresses the problem of the 11 to 12 million illegal immigrants now in the United States. Some believe the Senate's three-tiered approach to dealing with undocumented workers now in the U.S. amounts to what many would refer to as amnesty. Their approach is as follows:

Those illegal immigrants that have been in the United States for 0–2 years would be deported; those who have been illegally in the United States between 2 and 5 years would have to return to the border for processing and then reenter the country receiving a work permit; those who have been in the country for 5 years or more illegally would be able to obtain a legal status by paying a fine and meeting some other requirements.

So many have been concerned about this because it does mean that you could enter the country illegally and gain a legal status while still in the United States, which again many people would refer to as amnesty. So there is obviously tension between the House and the Senate bills, and the concern right now is that there may not be a bill that will be suitable to both bodies that can be achieved in conference.

The big concern I think, in the House at least, is what has been referred to as the three-tiered approach in the Senate. And, obviously, most people who are here illegally at the present time are going to claim they have been here 5 years. It may be very difficult to ascertain how long somebody who is undocumented has been in the country because they are undocumented. It is very hard to ascertain what records are valid, which are not, and how long they have actually been here.

As a result, I have introduced legislation that could represent some common ground. This obviously will be controversial. No one agrees entirely on how we might go about bringing the two bills together, but I have introduced a bill called H.R. 4065, and the basic requirement are as follows:

It would require illegal aliens to return home to apply for a visa. In other words, they would have to return to their country of origin and apply at their home country consulate. Much of the paperwork could be done in the United States before they leave here, but it would have to be stamped in their home country. They then could reenter the country with a legal status and cross that border with papers as documented workers.

Secondly, this would provide for a 3-year visa which is conditional on continuous employment. It would be renewed every 3 years. This would be open to undocumented workers with, first, a demonstrated U.S. employment

history. They would have had to have been somebody who is employed in the United States, has been employed satisfactorily, good recommendations by the employers, and then no felony convictions or any other major record of criminal activity or history.

So this would satisfy the argument that these people have come into this country illegally, remained here, and have gained a legal status. They would have to return to their country of origin.

So it establishes a new W visa for those who are classified as undocumented workers but have gone through these steps and stages at the present time.

Congressman PENCE has also introduced legislation which calls for illegal immigrants to leave the United States, report to centers located outside the country before reentering the country with a guest worker visa, which is somewhat similar to what I am talking about here. So this is not necessarily a novel or new idea, and many people have taken a look at it.

The requirement for all illegal immigrants to leave the United States and enter into the U.S. legally with a W visa may serve as a way to create common ground between the House and the Senate bills.

□ 1800

It is important that an immigration bill pass this year. I think the American people are expecting it and hope it will happen. Yet we are so far apart in the two bodies that this may be difficult to effect.

So H.R. 4065 may serve as a catalyst to compromise and final passage. I would like to have my colleagues at least give it some consideration because we will have to think outside the box a little bit. I think it will take some innovative solutions to this problem. It is something that again is something that is really important for this body to accomplish before the end of this session.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 861, DECLARING THAT THE UNITED STATES WILL PREVAIL IN THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109–502) on the resolution (H. Res. 868) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 861) declaring that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror, the struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FLOOR DEBATE ON GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, a remarkable document showed up in our mailboxes this afternoon. It is called a ''Confidential Messaging Memo'' for the floor debate on Iraq and the global war on terror.

This is apparently a memo that Republican leadership provided to Members on their side so they would know how to go about rubber-stamping the President's every thought and deed and could do their best to make sure that we don't have the kind of debate that the American people deserve.

The American people deserve to have us talk about what is really going on in Iraq and how it does or does not make us safer. They deserve to have mistakes acknowledged and paths forward discussed honestly and frankly, admitting problems and working together to make things better.

They deserve a Congress that is more interested in their security than in scoring points for the November election.

According to the Republican leadership's tactical memo, this is precisely what the American people will not get. Instead, there will be confusion and intentional misdirection. There will be ad hominen attacks, and that means attacks on individuals, and attempts to make Saddam Hussein and 9/11 more or less the same thing, attempts to call Democrats' legitimate questions about the administration's rationale for war and conduct of the war into what, and I quote, ''policies to concede defeat on the battlefield.''

The memo is filled with advice on how to deflect, confuse, conflate and con. I would like to enter that memo into the RECORD so everyone will be able to read it and not be confused when they hear the debate begin tomorrow. They will know what the script is that the other side is following.

Mr. Speaker, let me read some portions now because I think we all have a right to know what Republicans are advising their Members to say and think.

''During this debate, our Republican Conference should be focused on delivering these key points:

''The Importance of Our Actions. It is imperative during this debate that we reexamine the conditions that required the United States to take military action in Afghanistan and Iraq in the aftermath of the attacks of September 11, 2001.''

In other words, the Republicans are being told to continue the big lie that Iraq was behind 9/11 or had something to gain from 9/11, and it is all tied together in one neat package.

Secondly, the Republican leadership wants to make the point that they are smart and tough enough because they don't look back, they don't analyze, they don't admit errors, and they don't learn.

Now if they were a baseball pitcher who was this bad, Rumsfeld would have been jerked five innings ago. But, of course, our President ran the Rangers and gave Chicago Sammy Sosa, so we know his judgment in baseball.

Now to do anything else, according to their memo, is to be ''prone to waiver endlessly'' or ''to abandon our efforts'' against terrorism. It is as if the Republicans believe there is only one kind of effort against terrorism that has validity, and that any kind of thoughtful consideration of alternatives is a sign of cowardice and weakness.

''Republicans believe,'' the memo says, ''victory in Iraq will be an important blow for terrorism.'' Yes, of course, it would be. But what is victory in Iraq and how do we get off the path we are on presently and onto that victory path?

We are forbidden to talk about those questions. It would be wrong for 435 fairly well-educated, loyal Americans, who have been sent here by their districts to help govern this country, to start raising questions about what we ought to do.

There will be one proposal with no amendments; that is it. It would be ''weak'' and ''wavering'' and a sign of ''abandoning our efforts'' if we attempt to make those efforts more rational and successful and relate them to the goal of making Americans safer.

We are in trouble in Iraq. We don't have a plan except to keep plowing ahead with the same old policy: a strategy that is getting Americans and Iraqis killed and driving Iraqis to despair and helplessness. We don't have a Congress that can step up and take responsibility and try to make the administration listen to reason.

The President's policy is to put the control of this in the hands of the Iraqis. When they stand up, we will stand down. Who is going to tell the Iraqis when to stand up? The clerics, of course. The Shiia and Sunni clerics will decide when they stand up. What if they don't tell them to stand up? We are there until it ends.

This is a charade. We will go through it tomorrow, but it will not shed any light on where we ought to be going as Americans.

And we don't have a Congress that can step up and take responsibility and try to make the administration listen to reason.

So the Republican leadership scheduled public relations time in the House in an effort to stop the Republican free fall in the polls.

Republican leaders cannot tell the American people what they intend to do except more of the same.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better. I call on the Republicans to abandon the cynical strategy put forth by their leaders and think for themselves.

CONFIDENTIAL MESSAGING MEMO—FLOOR DEBATE ON IRAQ AND THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

This week, the House of Representatives will engage in a debate about the war in Iraq, the Global War on Terror and our efforts to strengthen our national security in a post-9/11 world.

The past week has brought news of several important, positive developments in Iraq and the Global War on Terror:

U.S. military forces eliminated the terrorist Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, al-Qaeda's top commander in Iraq and a cold-blooded killer.

The Iraqi government named new interior, defense and security ministers as part of the new government's continued progress.

Just this morning, President George W. Bush traveled to Baghdad to meet the newly appointed Prime Minister of Iraq, Nouri al-Maliki and to discuss our growing partnership with the new democratic ally.

Clearly, these positive developments are the result of steadfast support of both our military and diplomatic efforts in Iraq and across the globe. We should not refrain from touting such progress.

During this debate, our Republican Conference should be focused on delivering these key points:

THE IMPORTANCE OF OUR ACTIONS

It is imperative during this debate that we re-examine the conditions that required the United States to take military action in Afghanistan and Iraq in the aftermath of the attacks of September 11, 2001.

The attacks we witnessed that day serve as a reminder of the dangers we face as a nation in a post-9/11 world. We can no longer expect oceans between us and our enemies to keep us safe. The plotting and planning taking place in terror camps protected by rogue regimes could no longer go unchecked or unchallenged. In a post-9/11 world, we could no longer allow despots and dictators like the Taliban and Saddam Hussein to ignore international sanctions and resolutions passed by the United Nations Security Council.

So, during this debate we must make clear to the American people that the United States had to take action in the best interests of the security of our nation and the world community. As Republicans who supported military action against Saddam Hussein and terrorists around the globe, the United States had to show our resolve as the world's premier defender of freedom and liberty before such ideals were preyed upon, rather than after standing witness to their demise at the hands of our enemies.

As President John F. Kennedy once stated so eloquently:

''The cost of freedom is always high, but Americans have always paid it. And one path we shall never choose, and that is the path of surrender, or submission.''

A PORTRAIT OF CONTRASTS

This debate in the House of Representatives gives our Republican Conference the opportunity to present the American people our case for strong national security policies whose purpose is to protect the nation against another attack on our own soil.

Similarly, we must conduct this debate as a portrait of contrasts between Republicans and Democrats with regard to one of the most important political issues of our era. Articulating and advocating our core principles will allow the American public to witness Members of Congress debate a fundamental question facing America's leaders:

In a post-9/11 world, do we confront dangerous regimes and the threat of terrorism with strength and resolve, or do we instead abandon our efforts against these threats in the hopes that they will just fade away on their own?

Republicans believe victory in Iraq will be an important blow to terrorism and the threat it poses around the world. Democrats, on the other hand, are prone to waver endlessly about the use of force to protect American ideals. Capitol Hill Democrats' only specific policy proposals are to concede defeat on the battlefield and instead, merely manage the threat of terrorism and the danger it poses.

These are troubling policies to embrace in a post-9/11 world. During this debate, we need to clarify just how wrong the Democrats' weak approach is and just how dangerous their implementation would be to both the short-term and long-term national security interests of the United States.

RESOLVE WILL TRIUMPH OVER RETREAT

As a result of our efforts during this debate, Americans will recognize that on the issue of national security, they have a clear choice between a Republican Party aware of the stakes and dedicated to victory, versus a Democrat Party without a coherent national security policy that sheepishly dismisses the challenges America faces in a post-9/11 world.

Let there be no doubt that America and its allies in the war in Iraq and the Global War on Terrorism face difficult challenges. The American people are understandably concerned about our mission in a post-Saddam Iraq. There have been many tough days since Iraq's liberation and transition to a sovereign democracy.

Democrats are all too eager to seize upon the challenges we face as their rationale or motivation for retreat. As Republicans, we understand the diplomatic and national security hazards of such a move.

We must echo the American public's understanding of just how great the stakes are in Iraq and our long-term efforts to win the War on Terrorism.

Building democracies in a part of the world that has known nothing but tyranny and despotism is a difficult task. But achieving victory there and gaining democratic allies in the region will be the best gift of security we can give to future generations of Americans.

IRAQ DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, we do have an important debate coming before this House tomorrow discussing what we are doing to defend America through what the President calls the war on terror; what I refer to as the war against Islamic extremists.

I had a colleague earlier refer to the big lie. Well, there is a big lie propagated by the left in this country that we have no enemies abroad; and beyond that, we should not fight those enemies where they are.

We are making progress in this war against Islamic extremists. Make no mistake about it, this is a generational fight. While my grandparents fought the Nazis and my parents fought the Communists, very harsh ideologies that sought to destroy our way of life, that sought to destroy who we are as Americans, we too have a generational fight in this war against Islamic extremists.

And I will say in the last week we have seen some very positive prospects coming from Iraq. There are those who want to deny that we are making progress, and they have every right and ability to do that because we have freedom of speech here in the United States because of our constitutional freedoms. We are trying to bring that same level of freedom to those that are living in repressive regimes, which those repressive regimes are the ones that are propagating terror against us in the United States. So if we spread peace and freedom and democracy around the world, we will have fewer enemies that seek to destroy us and to kill Americans.

Now, in the last week we saw the destruction of Zarqawi, a militant extremist in Iraq, a terrorist mastermind, who was seeking to destroy our troops, to hurt our men and women in Iraq and to destroy the progress they are making for themselves in Iraq. But we did root him out. That was a wonderful, positive step. We should be proud of that action.

Beyond that, we saw progress with the government of Iraq taking shape and form with the security ministers being put into place and the final government being put into place. We are making progress there in Iraq and we should be proud of that.

Beyond that, there are extremists in Israel. There are extremists in Afghanistan and throughout the Middle East and some in this country that seek to destroy us. This is the reality of the day. Some would say we should deal with them with a legal strategy. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would say that is really removed from the realities of the war that we are fighting.

Our enemy hates our values. Our enemy hates our freedoms. Our enemy hates our capitalism that we embrace in this country. So we must fight them wherever they are and by any means possible.

But the left in this country, Mr. Speaker, don't want to fight this war. They know it is hard. They know it is difficult. But I would say to the left in this country, Mr. Speaker, that if we do not fight them, the values which they cherish, the freedom of speech and the freedom of dissent which we have in this country, the right to vote, the actual equality that we strive for in this country, although imperfect, the equality that we strive for, whether it be females having a place in society which we embrace here in this country, those extremists would not want that to happen. They want burqas worn by women. They don't want their participation. They don't want them to own property or have freedom of speech, wholly removed from what is our reality here in this country, although imperfect. But we strive for those values, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, our enemy will fight us in any way possible. We must have a

debate on this House floor on what means we are going to use, what direction we should take in this war on terror. This is a generational fight, and we as Americans must step up to the challenge and embrace the fight or they will destroy us.

IRAQ AND H. RES. 861

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, this morning the President of the United States said this about Iraq: ''My message to the enemy is don't count on us leaving before we succeed. Don't bet on American politics forcing my hand because it's not going to happen.''

Except, Mr. Speaker, it is completely unclear what constitutes success under these circumstances. Saying we will stand down when they stand up, well, that is just a talking point that gives the American people no clear guide as to when they can expect this war to end.

By leaving this question vague, by defining success entirely on his own secret terms, the President is allowing himself an open-ended commitment and a blank check in Iraq. As for his hand being forced by American politics, what the President calls American politics is actually a majority of Americans, American citizens outraged at the loss of life, the hundreds of billions spent, and the global credibility we have squandered.

Our people see 2,499, as of yesterday, U.S. troops killed; more than 18,000 U.S. soldiers gravely wounded, and thousands of others mentally and physically traumatized from their experience in the war. They see us losing the equivalent of one battalion every month in Iraq.

And they want answers.

All these sacrifices, and for what? None of it is making Americans or Iraqis safer. In fact, the presence of nearly 150,000 American troops in Iraq has become a rallying point for antiAmerican extremists in the Arab world.

This war becomes a bigger catastrophe with every passing day. And yet the President and the Republican majority have no plan to end it. From the President we get the usual platitudes and this week a photo-op in Iraq. And in this body, what is supposed to be the people's House, we are embarking on a pointless debate on a nonbinding Iraq resolution that is long on rhetoric and short on constructive solutions.

It is time we listened to the American people. It is time that the Commander in Chief stepped up by offering a solution instead of dismissing Americans' anxieties as ''just politics.''

I have outlined a plan that will end the occupation in Iraq while helping Iraq build a free and democratic society. We must engage the international community, including the U.N. and NATO, to establish a multinational interim security force for Iraq. The U.N.'s Department of Peacekeeping Operations is particularly well suited for this task.

We must shift the U.S. role from that of Iraq's military occupier to its reconstruction partner by working with the Iraqi people to rebuild their economic and physical infrastructure, and we must work with the U.N. to establish an International Peace Commission comprised of members of the global community who have experience in international conflict resolution to oversee Iraq's postwar reconciliation process.

□ 1815

They, our troops, have served admirably. They have sacrificed more than enough. We can return them to their families and we can do it without abandoning Iraq. This is what the American people want, Mr. Speaker. They want an end to this war. They are not certain exactly how or when, but it is our job to execute those details. They are looking to us for leadership and it is time the President of the United States, as the Commander in Chief, provided it.

ACTIONS OF MARK MALLOCH BROWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations has had a myriad of problems over the last 4, 5, 6 years. There has been tremendous scandals, there has been waste, fraud and abuse. There have been atrocities perpetrated by the U.N. peacekeeping forces in Africa where they raped women and maimed other people. We had the Oil-for-Food scandal. It just goes on and on and on. And as a result our new U.N. Ambassador has been over there trying to clean up that mess and make sure that they start straightening up and dealing with their fiscal problems as well as these other problems.

As a result, the second in command at the United Nations, a U.N. Deputy Secretary, General Mark Malloch Brown, last week made a very aggressive speech about the United States of America. He said that middle America, in effect, was too stupid to understand what the U.N. was all about. He indicated that news broadcasts from valued news resources such as Fox News and news commentators such as Rush Limbaugh were way out of line and didn't understand what was going on at the U.N. And he criticized roundly the entire United States approach to the U.N. and to world problems.

Now, there is an unwritten law at the United Nations and that is that the leadership over there and the people that are involved in leadership don't criticize member states. They just don't do it. Malloch Brown did, and he is the Chief Deputy to Kofi Annan, the Secretary General of the United Nations.

And it is my opinion, because of this terrible misstatement that he made, that he should be replaced. He should either resign or be fired. If we are going to work with the U.N., and we pay 25 percent of the dues over there for the whole world, 25 percent, then we need to have a good working relationship, and this is not conducive to this relationship when the second in command over there is criticizing the United States for taking issue with what is going on.

THE IRAQ WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I come this evening to share information that I think the American public must know and understand about what is going on in the Congress of the United States of America and what is going on with this war in Iraq. It is important that I do that this evening because tomorrow there will be on the floor of Congress a so-called debate. But it is a sham debate. This is a debate formed around a resolution, H. Res. 861, that the Republicans have put together in an attempt, one more time, to fool the American people about what they are doing. This resolution was dreamed up after the Republicans determined that the polls were consistently against the way this war is being managed. This resolution was put together after they went home on break and they heard over and over again that the American public is getting fed up with this war, the amount of money that is being spent, the number of lives that are being lost, and so they come to the floor, after having done no oversight, never explaining to the American public how billions of dollars are being spent, never taking the time to find out about the corruption and the mismanagement in Iraq, never investigating the lies and the lack of intelligence and all that has been happening. They have the audacity to come before the public in a so-called debate with the resolution simply designed to trap the Democrats.

It is a resolution that says all kinds of things. Do you love the soldier or don't you? If you don't support our resolution, you are not for the soldiers in Iraq. And so many Democrats are going to get trapped because they claim that in their districts they have half of their constituents for it, this war, and half against it, and they don't know what to do. And so when they have to confront a phony debate and a phony resolution, they may just say yes because they don't want to be criticized for not being patriotic and loving the soldiers and supporting them.

Well, I am here to say tonight it is a sham. And I would hope, overnight, that my colleagues on this side of the aisle would see the light and have the courage to vote against it, to not participate in the sham. But I don't know if they will or not.

But let me just give you the background and the backdrop of why all of this is happening. This war started March 19, 2003. Total number of U.S. troops in Iraq today, about 133,000. Number of soldiers dead, 2,499, as of June 14. Number of soldiers injured, 18,490, as of June 14. Total amount appropriated, including latest supplemental, $320 billion. The cost of the war per month, $6.1 billion, almost $11 million an hour. There were 1,398 reported killings in May alone, more than any other month since the war began in 2006, and that figure doesn't include slain soldiers or civilians killed in bombings. Yet, the President of the United States would make you believe we are winning the war. We are advancing. We are going to be able to turn this mess over to the Iraqis and they are going to be able to contain what is now a civil war.

According to the Pentagon, there are about 600 insurgent attacks each week since the new government took over in February. The rate of insurgent attacks is higher now than it was in 2004. Our soldiers are being killed. It is difficult for them to protect themselves against these bombings, these suicide bombings, these bombings that are set off in cars along the road and dead dogs and on and on and on.

And why are they dying? We are in this war because the President of the United States said that there were weapons of mass destruction that we had to protect against. All that we have encountered is mismanagement, corruption, missteps, a lack of winning this crazy thing. Soldiers dying and some of our young people now being charged with killing innocent people because they put guns in their hands and they told them to go and kill them because they hated it.

These soldiers should not be charged. The President of the United States should be charged. The Republicans should be charged and the Democrats should get some courage and come to this Chamber and make sure that they oppose this war.

ILLEGAL ENTRY INTO TUCSON, ARIZONA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, lawlessness on the border breeds more lawlessness in the United States. And failure to protect our borders is a national security issue. And I come to you tonight with some disturbing news. The threat is even more serious than many Americans know.

Tucson, Arizona is 65 miles from Mexico. I have it here on the map. It is shown by the red dot. It is the route to two interstates, one going north and south and one going east and west. Just southeast of Tucson, Arizona is the University of Arizona Technology Park. On that park, which is surrounded by an old-fashioned chain link fence, is a technology firm called Raytheon. Raytheon is a defense contractor that makes Tomahawk cruise missiles.

Well, neighbors in Tucson, Arizona have sent me some pictures of what appears to be illegal entry into the perimeter of this plant. Here we have the chain link fence. This photograph is taken inside the perimeter. On these premises, 400 acres, is the Raytheon plant. It is true there is another fence around Raytheon that is a fence that is a cable type fence that keeps trucks from coming through. But someone, of course, could crawl underneath or over that particular fence. And you see, Mr. Speaker, there is all types of litter inside the fence. And the question occurs, where does this come from? These are trails that are similar to what you see along the Texas border where I am from, but border towns down in Southeast Texas don't have a plant that makes Tomahawk cruise missiles. Tucson neighbors say these trails are filled with trash, backpacks, water bottles and clothes. And why is that? Well, it seems that the illegals that come from Mexico sneak under this fence and hide on these 400 acres until the human smugglers come back later and pick them up and transport them throughout the United States.

Raytheon public relations officials have said well, they hadn't heard anything about it from the security. And they have strict security procedures to enter that facility. But a supervisor at Raytheon security said yes, illegals have been known to come through the grounds, but they were just passing through. And some illegals have been found working at the Raytheon plant by subcontractors, but they were ordered off the premises.

I would like to show you some more disturbing photographs that the Tucson neighbors have sent me. This is a photograph taken inside the perimeter of the chain link fence. And you see numerous backpacks where illegals have come in to the perimeter, have hidden on the premises. When the human smugglers come to pick them up and take them into the heartland of America, they bring with them the backpacks that allow them to change clothes.

It is somewhat disturbing to me, Mr. Speaker, that we have this contractor that makes Tomahawk missiles that allows this to occur on their premises because, you see, lawlessness on the border breeds more lawlessness in the United States. And you would think that a company that has submitted a border security plan for the Department of Homeland Security just 2 weeks ago would be concerned about their border too. After all, it is a national security issue.

I have one more photograph to show you, taken on the same premises, but on the other end of the perimeter. A similar photograph of backpacks, water bottles left by the people that illegally entered the United States. How ironic that it is that they hide on the premises of a place and an institution that is trying to protect the national security of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Raytheon problems are our problems because the U.S.-Mexico border is not secure. We have to stop the illegal entry at the border between the United States and Mexico. Otherwise, we will continue to see these backpacks throughout the United States. And some may have clothes, but some may also bring in to the United States property and explosives that could damage the United States. It is a national security issue. It is a border security issue.

Mr. Speaker, we have an obligation to the American people and have to have the moral will to protect the borders and the dignity of the United States.

And that's just the way it is.

THE WAR IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, you have heard many of my colleagues talk about the debate tomorrow on Iraq and the war that we are facing. We also have a war going on in this country that unfortunately is very quiet, and that is the shooting and killing of people throughout this country.

Most people don't realize how many people die on a yearly basis because each newspaper reports it but we don't hear all that information nationwide. There are answers on how we can get there to stop this kind of killing.

Last month the House Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security approved my bill, H.R. 1415, the NICS Improvement Act.

□ 1830

This is a bill that would increase the effectiveness of the existing national instant criminal background check system, the database used to check potential firearms buyers for any criminal record or any other disqualifying criteria. Hopefully, the whole committee will take up this important piece of legislation soon so it can pass both Houses before the 109th Congress adjourns.

Overall, NICS has been a very good success. Since 1994 more than 1.2 million individuals have been denied a gun because of a failed background check. NICS also provides the vast majority of honest gun sellers with peace of mind in knowing they are selling their products to citizens who will use them safely and legally.

However, the NICS system is only as good as the information it contains.

And, unfortunately, many States do not have the resources necessary to enter all of their disqualifying criteria into the NICS system. The end result is that felons and others who are not permitted by existing law to buy guns are passing background checks and buying guns through legitimate means.

In fact, 28 States have automated less than 75 percent of their criminal history records. In 15 States, domestic violence restraining orders, which are a disqualifying offense, are not accessible through the NICS system.

These and other loopholes, of course, have cost people their lives, including two of my constituents. On March 8, 2002, Peter Troy purchased a .22 caliber semiautomatic rifle from a legitimate gun dealer in New York. He had a history of mental health problems, and his own mother had a restraining order against him as the result of his violent background. Mental adjudication and a restraining order are both NICS disqualifying issues. Yet Peter Troy's NICS background check turned up no red flags. It was illegal for him to purchase a gun, but like so many others, he simply slipped through the cracks in the NICS system because of lack information.

Four days later Peter Troy walked into Our Lady of Peace Church in Lynbrook, New York, my district, and killed two of my constituents.

Peter Troy had no business buying a gun, and the system created to prevent him from doing so simply failed. It is only a matter of time before the system's failings provoke larger tragedies. We must improve the NICS system and allow it to do what it was designed to do.

The responsibility for the accuracy and the effectiveness of the NICS system ultimately belongs to the States. However, many States' budgets are already overburdened. This legislation would provide grants to States and update the NICS system. States would be able to update their NICS database to include felons, domestic abusers, and others not legally qualified to buy a gun. The bill's goal is to have 50 States enter at least 90 percent of their disqualifying information into NICS. States that do not comply or fall short of these goals will be penalized with a 5 percent reduction of their Federal Department of Justice grant allocations.

Also, the bill would provide grants for State courts to promptly enter information into the NICS system. For example, when someone is served with a restraining order stemming from domestic violence, an inefficient NICS system allows him or her to leave the courthouse and head right to the gun store. My bill would make sure all relevant court records are entered into the NICS before a crime of passion can be committed.

It is important to keep in mind that this bill does not infringe on anyone's second amendment rights, which I support. It creates no new gun laws. It simply enforces the laws that are on the books. If H.R. 1415 becomes law, law-abiding citizens who want to buy a gun legally will not experience any delay at the point of purchase.

And this bill proposes no new burdens on gun sellers. In fact, I introduced this bill in 2002 and it was passed here in the House.

I am hoping that we can pass this bill rapidly. We have the opportunity to stop this small war in this country, and we can save lives, which is the most important thing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BILIRAKIS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. FOXX addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE WAR IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD extraneous materials this evening, particularly an article from the Christian Science Monitor entitled ''Prices Rise, and Interest Rates Sure to Follow.''

This evening we have heard from many of our colleagues about the ensuing debate tomorrow on a very weak resolution concerning the ongoing war in Iraq. Tonight I would like to direct my comments to the terrible taxes that this war places on the American people. And not just taxes in the conventional meaning of the word because, indeed, this war is causing us to borrow money, which we must pay back, and we are borrowing it back from foreign countries. This war is costing us more every day. Over $300 billion and rising. We have to pay those dollars back because we are borrowing them.

This war is placing a terrible burden on this economy as we now see prices rise and interest rates ticking up, which I will talk about in just a second. And, of course, the greatest tax is on the loss of life and the injury to body and limb of those that we have asked to fight the battles of this Nation, as well as innocent civilians who are being killed and injured across Iraq and the region.

This war in Iraq is also exacting a terrible tax on the people of the Middle East and adjoining regions because it is yielding more terrorism, not less. This war is yielding more repressive regimes in places like Pakistan; in places like Egypt; in the Palestinian Authority; indeed, adjoining nations like Lebanon. The tax on democratizing regimes is getting heavier and heavier every day. There is more instability in the region as we watch the demonstrations in the West Bank and in Gaza, as we see Hamas and Fatah locked in internal struggles. There is more instability, not more stability. And most crushing for our country globally is the United States is losing respect across the world. We have fewer friends and more enemies and those who doubt the United States across the globe.

Here at home we see rising interest rates, and that is the article I will enter into the RECORD tonight. Higher prices for such things as airline tickets, housing, health care, and, of course, gasoline are now starting to eat into consumers' pocketbooks. Indeed, this war is a terrible tax on the American people, and they are feeling it in their pocketbooks.

Wednesday, the Labor Department reported the May consumer price index rose .4 percent after a .6 percent rise in April. This is well above the comfort level of the Federal Reserve, the Nation's chief inflation fighter. The Fed is going to have to raise interest rates more out of a desire to keep the market from thinking the new sheriff in town at the Federal Reserve is not serious about fighting inflation. Prices are rising against a backdrop of weakening housing and other parts of the economy. This war in Iraq is a heavy tax.

Economists are most concerned that rising prices seem to have moved beyond the energy sector and removing food and energy, typically the most volatile prices from the inflation rate, indicates core prices rose in May .3 percent; and over the past 3 months, the core rate of inflation is up to an annual rate of 3.8 percent, the fastest pace in more than a decade. We are seeing a near-term acceleration in the core rate. An increase of half a percentage point at the next Fed meeting is a strong possibility before the Fed decides to back away.

So we look at what this war is yielding on many levels. More terrorism, not less terrorism. Is it yielding more democratic regimes throughout the Middle East? No. The oil regimes continue to be as repressive as they ever were. There is not a single democratic nation anywhere in the region, and there will not be one for a long time to come. The United States ought to decouple itself from the repressive oil regimes it continues to support and become energy independent here at home.

Is there a solution to the Palestinian-Israeli standoff? Are there ongoing negotiations? No. There is just shooting across borders. There are more demonstrations in the street. There is no back channel that is being actively promulgated by this administration to get the warring parties to sit down and finally reach a peace process following on the agreement that was attempted to be negotiated during the Clinton years.

Have we seen freedom on the rise? No. We see repression on the rise, as

beheadings and the election of people who are absolutely opposed to the United States without any sense of growing freedom.

There was a gentleman down here on the floor earlier who said that they do want our freedom here in the United States, that is why they hate us so much. Actually, a number of those revolutionaries want freedom from what they see us representing in that region, and that is support of dictatorships, support of oil regimes, and we are yielding the counterreaction to many years of supporting brutal dictatorships in that part of the world.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 15, 2006]

PRICES RISE, AND INTEREST RATES SURE TO FOLLOW

(By Ron Scherer)

It could be a summer of rising interest rates.

That's the sobering prospect for the U.S. economy following news that the inflation rate is running at a quickening pace. Higher prices for such things as airline tickets, housing, healthcare—and of course, gasoline—are now starting to eat into consumer pocketbooks.

Wednesday, the Labor Department reported the May Consumer Price Index (CPI) rose 0.4 percent, after a 0.6 percent rise in April. This is well above the comfort level of the Federal Reserve, the nation's chief inflation-fighter.

The latest numbers just about guarantee the Fed will hike interest rates at the end of the month. Its new chairman, Ben Bernanke, an avowed inflation-fighter, may follow that with yet another increase in August.

The inflation pop, however, comes at a time when the economy may be starting to cool. This could keep the Fed from hitting the brakes too hard.

''The Fed is going to have to raise rates more out of a desire to keep the market from thinking the new sheriff in town is not serious about fighting inflation,'' says Anthony Chan, chief economist at JP Morgan Private Client Services in Columbus, Ohio. ''Prices are rising against a backdrop of weakening housing and other parts of the economy.''

Economists are most concerned that rising prices seem to have moved beyond the energy sector. Removing food and energy—typically the most volatile prices—from the inflation rate indicates that ''core'' prices in May rose 0.3 percent. Over the past three months, the core rate of inflation is up to an annual rate of 3.8 percent, the fastest pace in more than a decade.

''We're seeing a near-term acceleration in the core rate,'' says Gregory Miller, chief economist at Suntrust Banks in Atlanta. ''An increase of half a percentage point at the next Fed meeting is a strong possibility before the Fed decides to back away.''

However, Mr. Chan reports that such a large rate hike is not likely. In the past, Mr. Bernanke has said previously, the Fed has tended to ''overshoot'' by raising rates too high or dropping them too low. The central bank would then have to change directions, confusing the markets.

''I don't think Bernanke is going to put in a strong case for a half a percentage point increase,'' Chan says. Though the inflation rate is accelerating, the economy has changed considerably since the last major period of inflation in the 1970s, Chan says. Back then, whenever the consumer price index rose, wages automatically ticked up via ''cost of living adjustments.'' Most of those arrangements are now gone, he says, particularly at manufacturing facilities, like General Motors Corp., where total remuneration is being cut, not raised. ''A slowing economy will eventually lead to diminished pricing pressures,'' Chan says.

Until that happens, consumers are starting to feel the effects of rising prices on their pocketbooks. For example, airfares rose 2.6 percent in May, according to the CPI report. Brian Hoyt, a spokesman for Orbitz.com, says airline ticket prices this summer are up 10 percent over last year's.

Amy Kelley of Calverton, N.Y., can attest to this. She's been searching for less expensive tickets for a vacation to Seattle. ''I can't find the bargains I used to,'' she says.

While the higher airline prices are related to the rising cost of jet fuel, the CPI also points to rising medical expenses, which were up 0.3 percent in May. In Philadelphia, Warren West, president of Greentree Brokerage Services, says the cost of providing medical benefits to his employees rose 16 percent this year. ''There is no way to pass this on to the end user. We don't have that kind of pricing power,'' he says.

In fact, inflation in services is a growing issue, says economist Robert Brusca of Fact and Opinion Economics in New York. ''The last two months there has been service-sector wage pressure,'' Mr. Brusca says, pointing out that two-thirds of the jobs in the economy are service-related. ''Inflation pressure on goods is not that bad, but in services they seem to be building.''

Part of the reason for the service-sector price increases is supply and demand, says Sandy Horwitz, an accountant in Coral Gables, Fla. His firm, Goldstein Schechter Price Lucas Horwitz & Co., has raised its billing rates 5 to 7 percent this year, he estimates. ''There is a shortage of accountants and pretty strong demand out there, so we need to meet people's salary requirements,'' he says.

Miami lawyer Matthew Krieger says demand for his legal specialty, immigration law, is so strong he has been able to increase his billing rates from 10 to 20 percent this year. ''There is a shortage of good attorneys in our area,'' he says. ''It's a very complex area of the law.''

In terms of prices, ''rents'' is one of the fastest ascending groups. The government calculates rents by determining what individuals would pay for housing if they were renting to themselves. Last month, rents rose 0.6 percent, the fastest pace in years. Since housing represents 25 percent of the CPI, it is a significant contributor to the overall inflation jump.

In Miami, landlord David Lombardy says tenants are not seeing rents climb—up about 30 percent in the past year, he estimates. A one-bedroom apartment at the Mirador on South Beach is now renting for $1,400 a month, up from $1,000 a month last year, he says.

Still, Mr. Lombardy expects rents to drop eventually due to the rising number of luxury condominiums coming on the market. ''All those people who bought on speculation will try to flip them, and when they can't do that they will try to rent them. So this will bring rents down in 12 to 18 months,'' he says.

THE IRAQ WAR ''TALK-A-THON''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, America deserves a real choice about our future in Iraq. But, instead, tomorrow it is presented with a false choice. Indeed, not so much a debate about our future in Iraq as a 10-hour or so talk-a-thon. The talk-a-thon is about a resolution that, much like the Iraq policy we have seen over the last few years, is presented to this House without the ability of any Member of the House to change a single word. You cannot dot an ''i.'' You cannot cross a ''t.'' You cannot offer an amendment. You cannot offer a substitute or alternative policy. Once again, in a very constrained and perverse way, the question of Iraq is presented for Members to talk, but not to act.

Indeed, the resolution itself tells the whole story. It is entitled a resolution which is ''declaring that the United States will prevail in the 'Global War on Terror.' '' Wouldn't it be wonderful if by simply passing a declaration we could declare the ''Global War on Terror'' won?

But tragically it is paper like this that was offered by those who failed to fulfill their decision-making and oversight responsibilities in this Congress that exposed young men and women from this country to the greatest danger. Instead of Kevlar vests, instead of reinforced vehicles, they got paper resolutions. And paper resolutions could not block the IEDs, and it could not block the bullets that came the way of our brave young men and women in uniform. No. Indeed, other than paper proclamations, the original claim was the main thing our troops would need in Iraq, as they were being sent off to war, was a broom to sweep away all the rose petals that would be thrown at them in gratitude for them invading Iraq. Well, of course, it did not turn out that way.

This false choice that we are being presented with tomorrow without any opportunity to dot an ''i'' or cross a ''t'' deserves some consideration. It has a ''Whereas'' clause that ''by early 2003, Saddam Hussein . . . had supported terrorists, constituted a threat against global peace.''. The reason that language is there is to perpetuate the lie, and it is a lie, that Saddam Hussein was somehow linked to the tragedy of 9/11.

Now, we know that Saddam Hussein was a villain, a thug, a dictator, and a tyrant. But there has been absolutely no evidence presented to this Congress to support the continued innuendo and suggestion by this administration, time and time again, that he somehow was responsible for 9/11.

Then there is a clause in the resolution that ''the terrorists have declared Iraq to be the central front in the war against all who oppose their ideology. Well, the truth is it became a central front only after President George Bush started a war there. He provided the terrorists with the opportunity; he took our young men and women to them, placed them in grave danger, provided an inadequate number of troops so that all these Iraqi ammunition and weapons dumps were open and

available to any terrorist who wanted to come in and take their weapons to use against our American forces.

The resolution refers to our ''coalition,'' and, of course, our ''coalition'' is the United States, the United Kingdom, and a great deal of public relations. Because most of the other countries in the so-called ''coalition'' have contributed extremely meager resources. They have been there for public relations purposes to try to cover the fact that this was a go-it-alone invasion of Iraq.

And now the ''impressive victories'' of which this resolution speaks do not take into account that the number of deaths of young Americans is approaching 3,000; 3,000 human beings, 3,000 young people cut down in their lives, removed from their families. We approach another 20,000 who suffered grievous injury, who may never be quite the same because of the injuries that they suffered in courageous service to our country.

And that takes us to why this resolution is being presented in this form. Because from the outset this administration and the leadership in this Congress have never missed a chance to hitch a ride for their failed policies on the coattails of the courageous men and women who have been standing up for our country overseas.

□ 1845

They know their failed policies can't stand on their own merit, and so they buried them within a resolution honoring the sacrifice of our United States troops. I honor them, but say that our policy must change and must change now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BISHOP of Utah addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the war in Iraq is a monster storm. It is a social tsunami battering the positive components of our potentially great society. The billions of dollars being poured into this war could solve dozens of major catastrophic problems that are facing our Nation.

Recently, a new report was released, authored partially by our own Science Committee, which said that we have a dangerously inadequate education system. When I came to Congress in 1983, Ronald Reagan was saying the same thing. He had a commission which came out with a report that said, our Nation is at risk. We still have not done anything of great substance to deal with the problems that were highlighted. We still have not appropriated the money to build laboratories in public schools, junior high schools and high schools. We still don't have adequate libraries. We still don't have the money which pays salaries which would produce the science teachers that are necessary.

We have a crisis in health care. Forty million people are not covered at all and there are many others who are inadequately covered. We have falling standards of living with gross inequities. The assets that reflect wealth among black Americans total less than $20,000 per family. $120,000 per family for white Americans. Both standards are falling, not climbing.

I am a member of the Out of Iraq Caucus. I welcome the opportunity tomorrow to begin a debate which would at least allow us to discuss in an open forum the problems we are facing. Any discussion is important because this is such an important problem. We have employment problems that are mushrooming, we have all kinds of things that should be discussed, and now is the time for all Americans to come forward and make their contribution toward a solution known.

Common sense is welcome. It might shed a lot of light on some of the problems and offer some real solutions. Scientific expertise is welcomed. Mother wit. We need the fresh visions of the young and we need the seasoned wisdom of the elders. Everything we can do is needed in order to solve these problems. Let every question be set forth. Let every possible solution be stated. We Americans are faced with a problem which is far more complex than the inner workings of a nuclear bomb, I assure you. The present explorations of the vast universe by astrophysicists are not as challenging as the need for a meaningful solution to this war blunder in Iraq.

There are many possible questions and solutions that I would urge should be placed on the agenda for discussion. However, I want to focus on just two of them tonight. One is the distribution of oil revenues. The other is the arrangements for the sharing of power among the majority Shiites and the minorities, mainly the Sunnis and the Kurds.

Oil revenues. We need a transparent, open, full discussion of what are the arrangements that have been proposed, or are being proposed, or are already in place for the distribution of the oil revenues from the oil in the ground in Iraq. Oil is their greatest resource. They have one of the greatest resources in the world. They are number three or number four among the nations producing oil. Yet there is very little discussion about what we are doing. To what degree is Halliburton going to control the revenues as their payment for the reconstruction that they have done of some of the oil wells? To what degree are the oil companies going to control revenue because of their arrangements for the pipelines and the shipping and the retail outlets in various countries? What is going to happen to the oil? These are questions that are being asked by the people of Iraq, I assure you. These are questions that are stumbling blocks, I assure you, in the completion of a government. Everybody in every section of the country wants to know how the oil revenues are going to be distributed. If I live in a province where there is no oil, will my area benefit? These things need to be dealt with.

Sharing power relates closely to this. We need to let them know they all share power. Regardless of whether they are Sunnis or Kurds or some other minority, the majority Shiites need to share power in some way.

We have a problem with sharing power across the world. There are many nations now struggling with this problem, so we should bring to bear all of our possible solutions and try to help resolve the problems in Iraq. We need the most creative approaches possible for power sharing which gives all Iraqis a stake in their new democracy. Ending the war in Iraq, ending the massive death and injuries, ending the waste of billions of dollars must be our number one agenda. These problems must be solved. We must pass and implement the Murtha resolution now. We must bring the troops home now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ROSS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DELAHUNT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. KUCINICH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Once again it is an honor to address the House. The 30-Something Working Group is back again to share with the Members what we have been working on the last week and not only coming up with new ideas for America but making sure that we package the ideas that are clogged up in this process here from moving onto the statute books of the United States laws to allow Americans to live a better life and to also put forth policy that will benefit those that are overseas fighting on behalf of this country and what we have asked them to do.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, we have talked a lot about fiscal responsibility. We have talked a lot about the lack of health care in the United States of America. We feel we have proposals that are on the table, ready to be considered if the Republican majority would allow it to be considered. Unfortunately, that has not happened. There has been a lot of discussion on the floor about Iraq, but there has also been a plan that was unveiled in the last few days to share not only with the American people but with the full House that if we can't work together in passing legislation in a bipartisan way that is going to help all Americans, not just Republicans, not just Democrats, not just independents, not just individuals that are wealthy, not just individuals that are poor, not just individuals that are making a way out of no way, to help all Americans so that we can move forth and we can find ourselves in a better situation than what we are in now, then we are willing to take the mantle and to have an opportunity to be the majority in this House.

We have the will and the desire to lead in the areas that we need to lead in. And we have this plan on housedemocrats.gov on the Internet for individuals to go on and take a look at what we are talking about as House Democrats.

When we have the opportunity to put forth this plan, if the American people see fit that that should happen, which I believe they will, hopefully they will, because the situation that we are in right now is dismal and presents a very, very challenging future for our children and for our grandchildren, because so many issues are facing this country in unprecedented ways. I think it is important that you take a good look at that. That's housedemocrats.gov.

In that plan which was unveiled by Leader PELOSI and other Democratic leaders in the Democratic Caucus this week, we talked about making health care more affordable for Americans. This is a major issue, Mr. Speaker, not only for individuals that work on jobs, work for individuals but individuals that are providing jobs. They cannot continue to take on this health care burden without a true plan, a true leadership from the Federal Government. States can't do it alone. Local communities can't do it alone. We are going to have to do it in a way that is going to benefit the people and not the special interests. I think where we are right now, Mr. Speaker, is that the majority here in this House has benefited the special interests as it relates to health care. I think the American people and small business men and women are yearning for some leadership right now.

Also, when we look at lower gas prices to achieve energy independence, this is something that is very, very important. We have pieces of legislation out there that promotes alternative fuels, to see more of E85 so that we can have flex vehicles that are out there, and it is a part of our innovation plan. Again, going on housedemocrats.gov, you can download this information, share it with your friends, with your family, and other Members can take it to their staffs and say, we want to implement this. But, of course, that is not going to happen under the Republican-controlled House of Representatives because I don't think the will and the desire is there to really have true innovation in alternative fuels.

The other thing I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is important, a part of our innovation plan that is also endorsed in comments by CEOs in this country, not just Democratic CEOs, independents, individuals who just lost faith in voting that are a part of major companies that are saying that the House Democratic plan, which will hopefully be a bipartisan plan once we are able to take control of this House with the help of the American people because of what is not happening here on behalf of the American people in innovation, they want us to be first in mathematics and science; they want us to be first as it relates to broadband access throughout this country; and they want us to be first in taking the lead and making sure that we push for energy independence in 10 years and develop that and make sure that we promote that through our legislation and through our appropriation. Not just giving dollars to the oil companies and saying, go ahead, we trust you, you do what you wish to do with the taxpayers' money while you continue to make record profits on the backs of the American people and we pay higher gas prices, and we are stuck in neutral with the engine running as it relates to true innovation.

I am not finished with our rollout, but I just want to point this out since I am mentioning profits. As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have read an article time after time again about the secret meeting at the White House in 2001 of the energy task force, that we know now that that task force meeting has worked in the best way for the oil companies and in the worst way for the American people.

Again, I am not a Member of Congress with a conspiracy theory, but I just want to say that we have third-party validators that are here. My staff just handed me this and I think it is important that I read this off: White House documents show that executives from big oil companies met with Vice President DICK CHENEY's energy task force in 2001, something long expected by environmentalists but denied as recently as last week by industry officials testifying before Congress. The document obtained this week, November of 2005, the Washington Post, shows that officials from ExxonMobil, Phillips, Shell Oil Company and BP met in the White House complex with Cheney aides who were developing national energy policy, parts of which became law and parts of which are still being debated.

I am saying that, and I just want to point this out, Mr. DELAHUNT, and I am going to flip it over to you, sir. 2002, it is not a coincidence that profits were up. Profits is not a dirty word but when you have profits and, quote-unquote, price gouging and the American people putting $10 in their tank at a time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And corporate welfare.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. And corporate welfare, you can't help but put this together. $34 billion in profits for Big Oil, 2002. 2003, $59 billion in profits. Looks pretty good. I think that meeting was worth going to. 2004, $84 billion. This meeting is now something that will be placed in the annals of oil industry that this should happen prior to major profits coming on.

□ 1900

Then, on 2005, $113 billion. This will continue to climb because the Republican majority doesn't have the will nor the desire to fight on behalf of the American people as it relates to energy, and the White House has shown that it has the will and the desire to allow special interests to come into the White House, write policy, and then come to the Hill and fight for that policy so that the oil companies can see this. Meanwhile, the American people are paying more for oil and for energy.

Then the individuals from the oil company have the audacity, and I am not going to blame them, because I think it is important that we put the blame where it should be. They don't have a Congressional voting card to vote for a policy to allow these prices to go up like this or profits to go up like this. It takes Members of Congress to do that, and I must say that I am proud to announce that a number, a supermajority of Democrats voted against this philosophy of oil companies having the opportunity on the backs of the American taxpayers, having their hand in the taxpayers' pocket and then, grabbing their wallet out of the other hand, they spend their money for necessities.

We are giving the taxpayers' money out in subsidies, but at the same time the oil companies are winning both ways, at the pump and with the tax dollars that the American Congress has appropriated. That is a fact, that is not fiction, and it is sad that it is a fact.

Mr. DELAHUNT, I am sorry, sir, for having you standing by so long.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I appreciate your observations, but I would just add one other component of what is not a pretty picture. If you don't have the desire, if you don't have the political will, or if there is influence that contradicts the best interest of the consumer, that in an of itself is a recipe for disaster.

But just imagine combining that with incompetence. That is when you have a tsunami, and that is what we are seeing time and time again from this administration without any accountability from the Republican majority. Tomorrow there will be—and it is not going to be a debate, it is going to be a lot of speechifying. There will not be any give and take.

But for the first time in over 3 years since this Congress voted to invade and to authorize the administration to invade Iraq, there will be a discussion of Iraq in the war there for the first time in over 3 years. I think what that tells you is that there is no debate, there is no discourse, there is no willingness to hold the administration accountable for incompetency.

Put aside all of the other concerns that you articulated, Mr. MEEK. But there was a story today in the newspaper that just underscores what you are saying, and I think emphasizes my point regarding the competence of governing or the lack thereof.

Let me read for just a moment. You have got to bear with me. This is from my hometown newspaper, the Boston Globe, and it is today. The government doled out as much as $1.4 billion in bogus assistance to victims of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, getting hoodwinked to pay for season football tickets, a tropical vacation, and even a divorce lawyer, Congressional investigators have found.

Now, let's be very clear. This was an investigation conducted by a nonpartisan agency that is an adjunct to the United States Congress called the Government Accountability Office. Here is what they found.

Someone stayed in a Hawaiian hotel for 70 days with taxpayer help. These same GAO investigators went undercover to expose the ease of receiving disaster expense checks from FEMA. They provided lawmakers with a copy of a $2,300 U.S. Treasury check for rental assistance that an undercover agent got using a bogus address. The money was paid even after FEMA learned from its inspector that the undercover applicant did not live at the address. When you don't hold people accountable, things get awful sloppy, if you don't hold Federal agencies accountable, whether it be the White House, the Department of Defense sooner or later.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Of course.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Both of you have made one overarching point, and that is that the government is broken. The government is not working the way it was meant to work. We have no leadership in Washington, D.C., from the Republican House, to the Republican Senate, to the Republican White House, that is willing to take on the gigantic task of reforming this government.

It is nothing but status quo. It is nothing but the same old tired ideas that get recycled election cycle after election cycle, with no real solutions. Whether you are talking about energy costs, or you are talking about the war in Iraq, or you are talking about Katrina, we have a broken government and nobody in Washington, D.C., with the guts to try to fix it.

Now, when you look at our foreign policy, and it has been mentioned already here, $8.8 billion given to Iraqi ministers by the coalition provisional authority and nobody knows where it is; $45 billion of American taxpayer dollars spent in Iraq on reconstruction, $96 million in cash and receipts remain unaccounted for a specific project, on and on and on. Why is it broke? Why is the American government broke? Because we are not having any success in rehabilitating the Iraqi economy.

Oil production below pre-war levels, electricity is below pre-war levels, 54 percent of Iraqi households lack access to clean water. On and on and on.

But the main line is this, that this country needs to go in a new direction. The American people are tired.

Mr. DELAHUNT. What the American people are demanding, Mr. RYAN and Mr. MEEK, is accountability. Because if there is accountability, then we will have competence in our government. But as you just indicated, whether it be Katrina, whether it be the prosecution of the war in Iraq, there has been no accountability by this Congress, none whatsoever. We are paying the price. We are paying the price in terms of our national treasure. By that, I mean our young men and women who are serving in Iraq.

We have already paid and are heading in the direction of one-half a trillion dollars for the prosecution of that war. What do we have to show for it? Well, we have generals from the Department of Defense who stood up as patriots, condemned what they saw in terms of incompetence by the civilian leadership in the Department of Defense.

I would ask one of you to quote retired Army General John Batiste on Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, who had this to say on April 13.

Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We went to war with a flawed plan that didn't account for the hard work to build the peace after we took down the regime. We also served under a Secretary of Defense who didn't understand leadership, who was abusive, who was arrogant, and who didn't build a strong team.

That is not TIM RYAN, that is not KENDRICK MEEK, that is not BILL DELAHUNT. That is a retired Army general who had action in the region.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And who served his country well, a highly decorated Army general who was sent to battle, to war, and there was never a plan crafted and designed for the peace.

Three years later, where are we? We are in Iraq, we are mired now in a sectarian battle between militias, insurgents. It has become a breeding ground for terrorism.

General Paul Eaton was responsible for the training of the Iraqi security forces in Iraq. What do we hear now? All we ever hear is that the Iraqis have to do it themselves, or we will stand down when they stand up. We will help them stand up. That was 3 years ago.

How long does it take to train a U.S. Marine or U.S. Delta Force operative or a U.S. Army Ranger, a member of the Airborne or a U.S. Army soldier or Navy? Three years? No, because the civilian leadership of this administration has been incompetent from the beginning.

This is what Paul Eaton had to say about what is happening in our Department of Defense.

Mr. MEEK.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Go ahead. Mr. RYAN is doing such an outstanding job.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. This is on Secretary Rumsfeld. He has shown incompetence operationally and tactically and is far more than anyone responsible for what has happened to our important mission in Iraq. Mr. Rumsfeld must step down. That is Paul Eaton, Army Major General's comments.

I think, Mr. DELAHUNT, this all gets back to what has been happening in this country, a refusal, an absolute refusal by this Congress to conduct the kind of oversight that is necessary. Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution, the founding document that really organized this country, gives the power to this Chamber.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. RYAN, do you realize that it has been more than 3 years, and this is the first time tomorrow that we will have a conversation about Iraq? There should have been hearings for the past 3 years. These heroes, these American heroes should have been invited to come before the appropriate committees of jurisdiction and allowed to testify about the incompetence of the prosecution of the peace in Iraq by this administration. But, no, they have been shut out, we have been shut out, and the American people don't know what is happening.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Will you yield, Mr. DELAHUNT?

Mr. DELAHUNT. I yield to my friend.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you, sir. The bottom line is that we have a Republican majority that rubber stamps everything that the administration hands to them. They can't even put the paper on the desk fast enough before they rubber stamp it. When you start

talking about the fact that by the Constitution we are supposed to carry out oversight, that is not a value of the Republican majority.

□ 1915

Oversight of what? No, see, they are too busy taking care of the special interests. You would think that some Members were more concerned with trying to make sure that special interests got what they needed because we do not want to forget the K Street Project where you pay to play and you get access into this Republican majority House.

So, when you look at the rubber-stamping of what has happened here, I cannot help but have this stamp here because that is how we got here, but what is very, very unfortunate is the fact that we have ourselves in a situation, in a fiscal situation that is going to take a generation almost to recover from. We have ourselves in a situation in Iraq we do not know how many years it may take for us to recover from that, and I am using the President's words now.

We have ourselves in a situation where the White House now, Mr. Speaker, wants to invite Members over to have tea and cookies right now and trying to be nicey-nice, to say we want to hear from you now; but we have men and women caught in the crossfire and we have millions and billions of dollars that have been wasted and stolen in Iraq. I am going to say stolen because of the rubber-stamp Republican majority. Anything that the administration sends down, how can we rubber-stamp it? Matter of fact, I think the Republican majority walks around with a little mini rubber stamp in their pocket, saying oversight: this is the way you want it and how you want it.

The American people HAVE to send a very strong message to this Republican majority here in the Congress that we have three branches of government for a reason, not two branches of government that deals with legislation and policy, but three branches.

We have the judicial branch that is separate and aside, but when you look at the legislative branch we are supposed to carry out oversight. Only a couple of Members of the Republican majority actually gets that and tries to practice it, but they are in a superminority.

And so the reason why we come to the floor is to shed light on the lack of oversight. When it was a Democratic House and a Democratic White House, there was oversight. Call Bill Clinton up and ask him. I think we know that. Republican majority, the reason why you are going to see people around here scratching and fighting and begging and trying to do anything and throwing out the sods and trying to get press releases out, because the White House is very, very concerned that they will no longer be able to send legislation to the U.S. House of Representatives and that it passes through committees that may have a half a meeting on it and come to the floor, not allowing Democrats to do anything to improve the legislation because they are too busy rubber-stamping the process, and it will disrupt that.

It is all about power and influence, and I can tell you right now, the Republican majority has gone too far with this because that is the reason why we are in the situation we are in now, and they are known. They have to shake it and they know it and they deserve the rubber stamp because that is what they have been doing since the President has been in the White House.

I am coming to Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I just want to give you a perfect example of what happens in a rubber-stamp Congress. Exhibit A, how can you borrow, Mr. Speaker, $1.05 trillion in 4 years? I do not even know how that can be achieved in 4 years. The Republican majority has handed President Bush, he cannot do it on his own, we have the Republican Congress right under him from 2001 to 2005, $1.05 trillion, now here is the other kicker, that comes in, and with interest. Forty-two Presidents, 224 years, 224 years, 42 Presidents, were only able to borrow $1.01 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, I rest my case on that. I rest my case on the fact that the Republican majority has given the Bush White House everything they wanted on the backs of the American people. The special interests got what they wanted. The billionaires got what they wanted.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Point of clarification. This is foreign money.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. This is just the foreign debt. This is countries that we have borrowed money from and now we owe them.

Now, I am going to be quiet for a minute, but I just want to make this one last point and it is going to be 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE, if I borrowed $100 from you, and let us say I still have not paid you back, our relationship will change. Matter of fact, your respect for me as an individual to be able to handle my own finances will be altered. Even though we are considered friends, our relationship is forever changed.

Now, for the first time in the history of the Republic, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the Republican majority has countries like China, Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Korea, the Caribbean nations, Taiwan, Canada, Germany and the OPEC nations looking at us in a different way, in an unprecedented way. The fact that, man, how can y'all tell me what to do on foreign policy and how can y'all point your finger to me as it relates to war on terror when you cannot even handle your own finances? That is not the American people. That is the Republican rubber-stamp majority. They have allowed this President to run this country into a fiscal nightmare.

So I close with that by saying, Mr. DELAHUNT, for you to say the generals are coming out, they are coming out because the American spirit is coming out of the chest of Americans that have put themselves in harm's way, because this administration and this Congress asked them to put themselves in harm's way.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I would like to ask a question of Representative JACKSON-LEE. If Democrats were the majority in this House, would there be a forum for General Greg Newbold, retired Marine Lieutenant General, to express his opinion before the appropriate committee of jurisdiction so that we could learn and the American people could observe what the truth was in terms of the prosecution of the war and the peace in Iraq? Would that opportunity be afforded to the American people?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank you, Mr. DELAHUNT. I am honored to be here with my distinguished colleagues from Ohio and from Florida and from Massachusetts because I think you represent the embodiment of the outcry of the American people.

We are in these Chambers but we cannot hear the voice of either rage, confusion or just simply asking why; and, frankly, what you have asked is whether or not we have three distinct branches of government, the executive, the judiciary and, of course, the legislature. Absolutely.

Because if you watched this Congress in the hands of Democrats some years ago, we proceeded with the Watergate hearings. We proceeded with Koreagate and Irangate, giving the American people the opportunity to see our wounds, to see our failures and to try and correct them.

Is it not interesting that in 1991, in the first Iraq War, I understand we were not here, they debated this question for 2, 3 days, hours, so that Members, no matter whether Republican or Democrat, could speak on behalf of the American people. There were three and four resolutions. People expressed themselves passionately, and therefore, they were able at the end of the vote to hold themselves accountable and to hold, of course, the Executive accountable: At that time, President Bush I.

Here we come tomorrow, and I have heard the map that shows that we are hostage as it relates to our deficit. Tomorrow, we come with a mere 5 hours. Somebody says there is a picnic that is going on that may even break through. I think it is important to ask that question because as you list the array of generals, let me share this with you.

I do not know how we can face the American people and not give credence to men and women who have bars of bravery on their chest, some wounded, some because of their service, who had nothing to gain by going against the Commander in Chief. In fact, one said I was about to become a two-star and three-star general. I was a one-star, I walked away.

And the reason why they walked away is because one of their issues is

that the military is depleted, that we will have years of rebuilding the United States military, which will take money, and this is not only physical and tangible things, tanks, arms, clothing, but it is a human capital that will have to be rebuilt.

How many of us understand that we have depleted our battalions that are supposed to be in Kuwait? We are down to one. These are the American mothers and fathers, wives and husbands, who are looking to this government to protect their young people, their husbands, their wives, their National Guard, their Reservists, that we have depleted them.

I loved Mr. MEEK in his anecdote, but it is like you run your shoes down. You do not have a heel and you are almost walking on the ground because you have got holes in it. That is, unfortunately, the military that we all love.

So I would say to you in answer to that question, and I thank you for allowing me to share that, the ignoring of the sectarian violence, the Shiias and the Sunnis, the Kurds are holding ground somewhere else. They do not want anybody to bother them. The fact that we still have our soldiers there doing nothing but sweeping up IEDs, that is not a mission of the United States military to sweep up IEDs. I hate land mines. I hate IEDs. Their mission is to finish, and until we hold this Congress accountable to do its job of oversight, until we hold the White House accountable to do its job, until we stop being embarrassed, until we stop losing our nerve, we will not.

Mr. DELAHUNT. This majority is prepared to give this administration, this White House, this Secretary of Defense, a pass on their incompetence.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. If you will yield for one moment, you are absolutely right.

We have a picture of these distinguished gentlemen. We know that some have suffered wounds, some may have even been in Vietnam, and to say tomorrow there will be somewhat of, I want to be, if you will, dignified and within the respect of this august body, but tomorrow, we will not be giving it respect.

What we really should do is have a debate into next week and next week, and we should open the doors of our hearing rooms for these generals who have been frustrated and doing op-eds and speaking to the American people from a forum that give them sound bites. We should dignify their service to this country and bring them in for them to be heard, and I hope that we will do that.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think the point that we are trying to make here is we know it is not easy to admit you make mistakes. It goes against your human nature. But when you are elevated to leadership positions like we have been blessed to be here and to represent our country, 700,000 people apiece, it takes courage.

It does not take courage to have oversight to chase a President's peccadillos around the Oval Office. That is not courageous. Courage is trying to say we have made a colossal mistake, and instead of going down the same road even faster, try to stop, reevaluate the situation and let us find out who we need to hold accountable here, who needs to be brought in before the Congress, as you said. That is not easy. That is difficult. That is one of the most difficult things about being an American, and being an American government is that your warts are here for all the world to see. But that is better than the alternative, which is tyranny and suppression and oppression by the government.

This is a part of our process, these problems getting aired out, but at the end of the day, it is part of our greatness because we can quickly then adapt, fix the problem and move on, but when you have leadership that is afraid—

Mr. DELAHUNT. And incompetent.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio.—afraid to address the real issues today, that is the basis of incompetence, whether you are in government, whether you are in business, whether you are in coaching. Does not matter what your field is. If you do not admit you make a mistake, then you are going to have problems. If a coach goes into a game with a certain game plan, and at half-time you are down 21 points, then you change the game plan; it has not worked. Move forward, move on, make the changes necessary to move the country forward.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Tomorrow we are going to hear terms like cut-and-run and defeat.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Absolutely.

Mr. DELAHUNT. That is what we are going to hear on this floor, and I challenge that Republican majority to use those terms when it comes to these generals, to these American patriots who have served their country. Ask them if they even would ever cut and run. They have demonstrated their entire careers, but they had the courage to stand up and say this is rank incompetence.

□ 1930

You are not doing right by the American soldier and by the American military and you are giving them a pass. You are letting them pass.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. How many of those generals are there? I am looking. Is it about nine or ten? Looks like it is about eight.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Every day there is a growing number.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. In your lifetime, Mr. DELAHUNT, have you ever heard of this number of generals, and I know Vietnam, I am trying to recount my history, this number of generals and sacrificing their career, offering their great history before us, willing to tell the truth to the American people?

I think this is history that we have not seen in the past; that they have been willing to sacrifice themselves in order to tell the truth to the American people.

Mr. DELAHUNT. That is why, as Mr. MEEK so eloquently observed earlier, it is time to take the country in a new direction. And there are specific proposals out there that will take this country in a new direction. He has enumerated several of them, whether it be health care or education.

How about just plain old common sense when it comes to managing our money? One-half trillion dollars and we are still mired in Iraq, tax cuts that benefit not even the wealthy in this country but the super wealthy, and if you notice this mismanagement, this incompetence in terms of our economic and fiscal policy, it is hurting people. Has anyone observed the Dow Jones? Has anyone called their broker to find out how their 401(k) is doing? There won't be an American left other than the super rich that will be able to retire.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield, the same type of philosophy with the war, refusing to be accountable and to address the major issues and trying to provide a lot of happy talk for the American people, it is the same with the domestic economy. President Bush says America's economy is strong and benefiting all Americans, yet at the same time, as this graph shows, college tuition is up 40 percent, gas prices are up 47 percent, health care costs are up 55 percent, and median household income down 4 percent. But the President is saying the economy is strong and benefiting all Americans. Where are you living? Not in Youngstown, Ohio; not in Niles, Ohio. Give me a break.

The challenges that the average American person faces today are enormous. The challenges are enormous, and we need to get this country out of this rut we are stuck in and move in a new direction. Let us talk about broadband access for every American, let us talk about fixing the health care crisis in the United States of America so small businesses don't have to pay as much for health care costs. They could reinvest it back into their company and maybe we could shrink the trade deficit just a bit.

We have an economy right now that is very competitive, competing with 1.3 billion citizens in China and 1 billion citizens in India. And they are focused on engineering and science and all of these other issues, yet we are making it more difficult and more costly to go to school. The number of people that have student loans now is going up and up and up, and the amount that they owe back is going up and up and up. I think the stat we used the other night, Mr. DELAHUNT, was that 8 percent of the people who have student loans owe $40,000 a year or more, up from like 1.5 percent 10 years prior to.

We can't make it more expensive, Mr. MEEK. We need to make it more accessible. And I would be happy to yield.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, I would like the Members, Mr. Speaker, to go to housedemocrats.gov, housedemocrats.gov, which has a new direction for America that the Democratic Caucus unveiled this week to let people know exactly what we are going to do.

Real security. We are going to implement all of the 9/11 recommendations to secure this country, our ports and our airports, and make sure that we have hometown and front-line security, so local law enforcement officers and law enforcement agencies don't have to rub two pennies together to make sure they can secure their communities, which are our front line here in America.

Also, we plan to bring about affordable health care along the lines of not only prescription drugs but also making sure that there is a health care system that can work for the private sector, the public sector, GM, and all of those companies that are having issues, including the Federal Government.

Good paying jobs. We will raise the minimum wage. That is not a question, that is a fact. That will happen, and it will pass this House of Representatives here when Democrats get in control of this House.

Affordable college education. We will reverse what the Republican Congress has done as relates to increasing student tuitions by $2,000, which has gone up 57 percent at public universities and in private universities about 32 percent; and also making sure that they have tax deductions for college opportunities.

We will energize America by having flex vehicles and energy independence within 10 years. That is not something, oh, well, maybe; we are thinking about it. No, we are doing that. That is under the new direction that Mr. RYAN was talking about.

And also making sure that people can retire in a dignified way and not privatize Social Security. And that is what that is about, and it goes on and on and on. So I encourage the Members to go on housedemocrats.gov. And if individuals want to talk about a plan, you can see a plan right there.

And we have Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. DELAHUNT, and the rest of the Members of the 30-something Working Group, the will and the desire to carry out the plan, not just talking about it. We said we had the will and the desire to balance the budget, and we balanced the budget. Period, dot.

And the other thing I just wanted to add real quick, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, it is almost like you see a cliff, okay? You see a cliff. Now, the goal is to stop before you go over the cliff, not to go half speed. Republicans are talking about cutting it in half. Cutting the deficit in half is not going to get us to where we want to be. You want to stop before you go over the cliff and they are going half speed. So eventually they are going over the cliff. I feel in a fiscal way we have gone over the cliff, and we are saying we want to take America in a new direction.

We have the resume for action and for fiscal discipline in this country and passing policies that will help the rich, those that are middle class, the poor, and making sure that businesses can prosper in this society. We have shown it during the Clinton years. Everyone was making money, everyone had hope, and everyone knew that the Congress and the White House had the will and the desire to put forth policies that would help the American people.

I yield to Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I just want to make this brief point, but you have hammered it on.

What you are saying is that this Congress is going to be action oriented. We are going to act. We are going to do. We are going to not come in and busy ourselves with the special interests.

What we are going to be doing is allowing generals to come in. We are going to be talking about, if you will, a new mission in Iraq, and this funding that has now almost eliminated any resources for any other domestic need, with the $10 billion a month we are spending in Iraq and Afghanistan. We are going to be action oriented.

And I just want to close on this point, because you have laid out not only the agenda of Democrats but our passion. Democrats are going to be focused on the needs of Americans. We are not going to be with the lights out, the doors closed, and the shutters drawn. We are going to be opening our hearing rooms and listening to educators. We are going to be listening to working men and women who are asking why they are not getting a tax cut. We are going to be listening to college students about Pell Grants.

And you know what else? In conclusion, we are going to do something that I hope we will be the champions of: The minimum wage. Because right now it is a disgrace that we are allowing Americans to make $5.15, which is the lowest minimum wage in 50 years.

So I say to you, thank you for laying out the agenda and letting the American people know that we are going to go in here waving the flags on their behalf and the minimum wage is going to be one of our number one items to do.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentlewoman. This is not about playing gotcha. This is not about saying hey, look, this, this, and that. This is about fixing the problems. We need the information that these generals on the ground will provide us so we can actually fix the problems. And we are going to reach across the aisle and work with the Republicans.

This is not about Democrat or Republican. This is about the United States of America. We need everybody's ideas, we need everybody's intellect, and we need all Americans to participate in this. These are complex problems. There is no liberal or conservative answer.

We are in a new realm. We are well beyond anything we could have ever fathomed with the technology, the innovation, the movement of the economy, globalization, techniques, and the whole nine yards. We are past all the old slogans: Lesser government and big government. We are past that. We are so far beyond that. But the leadership in the country needs to reflect the views of the United States of America and its citizens.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. If the gentleman will yield for just 30 seconds, I have to tell you about the committee I was in today, Mr. Speaker. I leaned over to one of my Republican colleagues, who I respect and who will go unnamed. And I said, you can do something good. Because it was one of those votes that you know Democrats vote one way and Republicans vote the other way and what have you. And I said, you can do something good by voting ''yes'' for this amendment. And she said, well, a million here and a million there, that adds up eventually, KENDRICK.

I said, you are telling me? I said, believe me, your caucus and your leadership have found a way to borrow as much as you can borrow, and then when you ran out of borrowing where you could domestically, you went over and borrowed $1.05 trillion from foreign nations that some of us have questions about. So you are telling me we know how to spend? You all have broken a record. You have made history in 4 years.

So when you look at it, it is sad, Mr. Speaker, that we can come to the floor with fact and not fiction. Some folks come to the floor with rhetoric and you can see right through it: Like, what is this guy talking about here on the floor? How could he possibly say that? That is not true. But, guess what, what we are talking about is true, unfortunately, because of the bad policies.

And that is the reason why we are saying, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, that we want to head in a new direction and we want the American people, Democrat, Republican, and Independent, to know that, A, we have got the will and we have the desire to lead in that direction. And it will happen. It is not like, well, we may get around to it. We are going to do it, whether the White House wants to do it or not.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I wanted to make a point that I was going through a GAO study today, and you can get it on the GAO Web site, and it showed two scenarios. One was what happens if we continue going down the same road we are on and we make President Bush's tax cuts permanent for the top 1 percent of the people, and it plays that scenario out through the numbers; what percentage of our budget we would spend on military and this, that, and the other. And one of the issues there was the interest on the debt.

If we keep implementing the Republican proposals that have been going on

for the last 5 years for sure, rubber stamped, but much longer than that in the Congress without the check of a Democrat President where they were working together, we will be paying so much money, a higher proportion of our annual revenues to interest on the debt that it will be staggering.

The American people will wholly reject that kind of fiscal policy. Because when you are paying interest on the debt, you get no value from that.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. None.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. You are not investing in education where you have millions of students that are now college educated inventing new things, helping us with alternative energy. You have none of that. You are not investing in health care, where kids and parents are healthier and workers are more productive. You get no benefit. You are giving money to China and they are taking the interest and they are reinvesting it back into their state-owned facilities and wiping out the middle class in America.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Well, Mr. RYAN, if I might just for a moment ask you to yield. What are we doing right now in the United States Congress? We are going through the appropriations process. Every single appropriation bill that comes we are having to tell our communities back home, you can't finish not the road to nowhere but the road this community needs; you can't get rail; you can't fix Amtrak.

They are telling us that the community health clinics that we have all bought into and that have some value, the quasi-public health clinics that so many people are excited about, we can't fund them. We can't provide new monies for the Leave No Child Behind, if you ever invested in that at all. We can't provide any monies for alternative research in energy for our universities.

And we can't provide them any dollars partly because of this misdirected mission with young people dying in Iraq and not being able to refocus, and then of course the fact that this deficit has continued to grow.

□ 1945

I just want to say, reiterate once again the sadness of how many foreign nations own the United States now.

Mr. DELAHUNT. We have an ownership society.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I didn't think we would see this. I hope the American people who are listening understand that this is serious. And we are not here trying to cast aspersions, but this is serious on behalf of the American people. I hope as Democrats take leadership on these issues, we have a chance to change lives.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. This is the problem we have. Two final points to wrap it up. Let's get back to the sense of the common good, Mr. DELAHUNT, where everybody benefits and everybody contributes.

We should demand as Democrats that every citizen in the country, able-bodied citizen, contributes to the good of the country and the economy. They get educated and everything else. We need to demand that of everybody. But at the same time those people who have benefited from the system, the economic system, the capitalistic system, democracy in the United States of America, all of these people need to contribute. The more you benefit, the more you are obligated to keep the system running. Everybody contributes and everybody benefits. Let's start focusing on the common good instead of all of these special interests.

It gets back to this, and this is one of the final points I want to make. Over the past 5 years we have figured out that we, myself personally and my constituents back at home, do not trust the judgment of the Republican leadership in the United States Congress and in the Senate and in the White House. It is not personal. They are good people, but their judgment has been very poor over the past couple of years.

And the end result is tuition costs are up 40 percent; gasoline prices up 47 percent; health care costs up 55 percent; median income is down 4 percent; and nothing with the minimum wage, lowering college tuition costs, and all of things that are going to lead, business incubators and downtown revitalization, all the things that this country needs.

Let's take this country in a new direction. I am excited about the opportunities we are going to have being in the majority in January. I think it is going to be an exciting time with new ideas and a lot of things that we can accomplish here in the United States.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I couldn't improve on everything that has been said. I am excited about the challenges ahead. I think we are going to take this country in a new direction. I think it is going to benefit the American people, whether they be Republicans or Democrats or unenrolled.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Americans.

Mr. DELAHUNT. It's America.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. We simply want to say we are prepared to roll up our sleeves. Nothing is guaranteed. We will be working real hard. And if the Democrats achieve leadership in November, we will have the roll-up-the-sleeve attitude, the open-door attitude, the oversight attitude, and what is best for the American people.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I think that really sums it up. If Democrats take control of this House, it is going to open the doors. It is going to open the windows. We are going to get a breath of fresh air, and accountability will be in vogue once more, for the first time in a long time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it would be an honor for me to watch and listen to you read that with your new glasses.

Mr. DELAHUNT. This is the 30-something Working Group, www.HouseDemocrats.gov/30something.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. One more time. Read it twice.

Mr. DELAHUNT. This is Leader PELOSI's 30-something Working Group, www.HouseDemocrats.gov/30something.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Thank you. Good job.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. With that, Mr. Speaker, we would like to not only thank the Democratic Caucus but also thank Members of the House for allowing us to come to the floor to address the House one more time.

PEAK OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, today I had a very pleasant visit with a very important person. Matt Simmons came by and we spent about an hour and a half talking. Now, who is Matt Simmons and why should we be interested in a discussion with Matt Simmons?

Matt Simmons is the President's personal energy adviser. He was the primary architect of his energy policy for his first campaign, continued with him through his second campaign. Matt Simmons is the president and CEO of one of the largest energy investment banks in the world, out of Houston, Texas, and he has written a book which I have here, ''Twilight in the Desert.''

I would like to read just a little bit from the dust cover of the book:

Saudi Arabia is the most important oil-producing nation in history. The secretive Saudi Government repeatedly assures the world that its oil fields are healthy beyond reproach, and that they can maintain and even increase output at will to meet the skyrocketing global demand. But what if they can't?

''Twilight in the Desert'' looks behind the curtain to reveal a Saudi oil and production industry that could soon approach a serious, irreversible decline.

In this exhaustively researched book, veteran oil industry analyst Matthew Simmons draws on his own three-plus decades of insider experience and more than 200 independently produced reports about Saudi petroleum resources and production operations.

What he uncovers is a story about Saudi Arabia's troubled oil industry, not to mention its political and societal instability which differs sharply from the globally accepted Saudi version. It's a story that is provocative and disturbing, based on undeniable facts but until now never told in its entirety. ''Twilight in the Desert'' examines numerous aspects of Saudi Arabia and its looming oil crisis.

Mr. Speaker, we had a discussion, as I mentioned, that was about an hour and a half long. Matt Simmons shared

with me his concern that the world is reaching a very critical point in its history, a point at which the oil production of the world will reach a peak, after which it will inevitably decline.

This is a message that I first started talking about exactly 15 months from today. It was March 14 last year, and I have here the exact charts that we used in our discussion, and I would like to go through a few of those charts. These aren't all of them, but all of these charts are charts from that first discussion.

We started with this chart. Recent headlines. This is Washington Post, the third day of February 2005, just a few weeks before our March 14 first discussion of this subject, and the subject was Peak Oil.

You see that is pasted on because we were discussing what should we call this discussion. The Great Rollover was one possibility, and the Great Rollover refers to that time in which there will be a rollover from a consumer's market to a producer's market when you have reached the peak and roll over the top. We finally decided to call it Peak Oil, and that is how most everybody who is talking about this phenomenon refers to it now.

These are headlines, and they could be headlines from today's paper, or yesterday's, because the Dow went up a little today.

This reads, ''The Dow dropped 174 points, driven by economic damage from rising oil prices,'' and they were relatively low 15 months ago compared to what they are today, ''the plunging dollar,'' and the dollar is still plunging, ''and growing worries about consumer spending.'' It could be today's headlines.

''Recent oil price rise of 20 percent is continues to crunch the profits of struggling airlines and is believed to be a factor in disappointing retail sales.''

''Dollar slides against the euro and the yen,'' and it is still sliding.

''Consumer confidence slips in February.'' These were the headlines of the paper.

What are they talking about? They are talking about some statistics that resulted in 30 of our prominent citizens writing a letter to the President, saying Mr. President, the fact that the United States has only 2 percent of the world's oil reserve and we use 25 percent of the world's oil and we import almost two-thirds of what we use is a totally unacceptable national security risk. We have just got to do something about that.

We represent a bit less than 5 percent of the world's population. We are one person out of 22 in the world, and that one person uses 25 percent of the world's energy and we import almost two-thirds of what we use.

Now we are really good at pumping oil. We have drilled about 530,000 wells in our country. There are on the order of magnitude, and I can't get the exact number, a thousand, more or less, in Saudi Arabia. We have 530,000, and I think there may be 3- or 400 in Iraq. Two percent of oil reserves are producing 8 percent of the world's oil. I think today we are still the world's third largest oil producer. We are far and away the world's largest oil consumer. How did we get here?

To find out how we got here we have to go back about six decades. The next chart shows us a prediction that was made by a scientist of the Shell Oil Company by the name of the M. King Hubbert. He worked for the Shell Oil Company. He observed a phenomenon in oil fields when they were pumped and finally exhausted, that appeared to be a characteristic of oil fields generally, and that was you reached a maximum after which the production dropped off and finally tailed off to near nothing.

He rationalized if he could know how many oil fields there were total in the United States and guess at how many more we would find, that he could then predict when the United States would peak in oil production. He made that prediction in 1956 and on the 8th day of March, just 50 years ago, this last March 8, he gave what would become a very famous speech in San Antonio, Texas to an oil conference and it was published as a paper. In that he predicted that the United States would reach its maximum oil production in 1970. In those days he was talking only about the lower 48.

Shell Oil Company asked him not to give that talk and publish that paper because it would embarrass him and them. He went ahead and did it; and, of course, we did peak in oil production in 1970 and so M. King Hubbert became an institution in his own time.

The smooth green curve here is his prediction. The more ragged green curve is the actual date and you see, right on schedule, it peaked in 1970, and then began falling off.

The red curve here is the former Soviet Union. They have more oil than we. They peaked a bit after us, and then the Soviet Union fell apart and their production capacity did not meet expectations so they are now having a second small peak.

Of the 48 major countries that produce oil, 33 of them have already reached their peak.

The next chart shows us where we have gotten the oil in our country. M. King Hubbert was predicting the production of oil in only the lower 48 and that would be this curve here that I am tracing, because he did not look at Alaska and did not include oil from that source.

Notice that we did peak in 1970 and then it starts downhill. And the very large discoveries in Prudhoe Bay and Dead Horse, Alaska just caused a little blip in the slide down the other side in Hubbert's peak. It did not reverse that. I have been to Dead Horse and Prudhoe Bay. I have seen the beginning of that 4-foot pipeline through which, for a number of years now, a full fourth of our oil production has flowed.

□ 2000

In spite of enormous production from Prudoe Bay, and in spite of a lot of production from the Gulf of Mexico, that is the yellow there. And you may remember, Mr. Speaker, the fabled Gulf of Mexico oil discoveries. They were so large that it would put any worries about oil far, far behind us. That is all the contribution they have made.

And by the way, we really are exploiting those fields because we have 4,000 oil wells out there in the Gulf of Mexico. We had reason to reflect on that last year when the hurricanes went through.

Now, these are the charts, Mr. Speaker, that I used. I had some additional ones too, but these are the charts that I used exactly 15 months ago today. It was the 14th of March. Two very significant things have happened since then. Two major reports paid for by the government have been published. One of those is the Hirsch report. It actually is dated February of 2005. That is just a month before I gave my first floor speech here on this subject. Neither I nor anyone else in the public knew that that research had been done and that report was available because it did not become available for several months after that. This is frequently called the Hirsch report. It is called Peaking of World Oil Production, Impacts, Mitigation and Risk Management. And in just a moment, I will show you a few quotes from that very important study. Then a little later than that, dated last September but not available publicly until just a few months ago, was another major study paid for by the Army, done by the Corps of Engineers, called Energy Trends and Their Implications for U.S. Army Installations. M. King Hubbert predicted that the world would be peaking in oil production about now. And the point I made 15 months ago, Mr. Speaker, was that if M. King Hubbert was right about the United States, and he was right on target, certainly, we are a microcosm of the world. And if he was right about the United States, shouldn't there have been some concern that he might be right about the world? And if in fact he was right about the world, shouldn't we have anticipated that and done something about it? We did not.

Let me show you, now, one of the quotes from the Hirsch report. That is from page 24. We cannot conceive of any affordable government sponsored crash program to accelerate normal replacement schedules. What they are saying is that if the world has peaked in oil production, and they said that it certainly would peak. It wasn't if, it was when. And they weren't really certain when it would peak because you wouldn't know that it had peaked until you were a bit past the peak and looked back. And that is very true. And they looked at all of the things that the government might do to mitigate the consequences of a shortage of liquid fuels. This is not so much an energy crisis as it is a liquid fuels crisis.

And they said they could not conceive of any affordable government sponsored crash program to accelerate normal replacement schedules.

The next chart has some very interesting and disturbing words in it. World oil production is going to peak, they said. It will reach a maximum and decline thereafter. That maximum is called the peak. They said that it is not if, it is when. It is going to peak.

Oil peaking presents a unique challenge. And I have highlighted it here. The world has never faced a problem like this. There is no precedent. We cannot look back in history and find any time when the world has faced a problem like this. This is a unique challenge. The world has never faced a problem like this.

And as a consequence of that, the next chart says that the peaking of world oil production presents the United States and the world with an unprecedented risk management problem. As peaking is approached, liquid fuel prices and price volatility will increase dramatically. Just a few years ago it was $10 a barrel. Now it is $70 a barrel and has been as high as $75 a barrel, will increase dramatically and without timely mitigation. The economic, social and political costs will be unprecedented.

These, Mr. Speaker, are quite strong words, unprecedented risk management problem and economic, social and political costs will be unprecedented.

The second report that I mentioned by the Corps of Engineers and the next chart has a quote from their study, reaches the same conclusion; that oil production will peak, that peak is either now present or imminent. And they say oil is the most important form of energy in the world today.

Just a moment's reflection on how important that source of energy is. 70 percent of all of the oil that we use in our country is used in transportation. There is no realistic alternative to liquid fuels for transportation.

Now, we can take oil and make other liquid fuels like ethanol, but for every gallon of ethanol that we burn, we have used at least ¾ of a gallon of liquid fuels, gasoline and diesel, oil to produce that energy.

Oil is the most important form of energy in the world today, and the energy density in oil is just incredible. One barrel of oil, 42 gallons, the energy in that represents the work output of 12 people working all year. So for just a little over $100, $3 a gallon, 42 gallons, a little over $100, you can buy the workout of 12 people working all year for you.

To get some idea that that is probably a realistic number, reflect on how far a gallon of gasoline or a gallon of diesel, by the way, still cheaper than water in the grocery store if you buy it in those little bottles that you drink from, how far that will carry your SUV or your car. You may get 10 miles from a heavy SUV, but try pulling that SUV those 10 miles and see how long it will take you. You can do that with a come-along and trees and guardrail beside the road, but it would take you quite some time to pull it the 10 miles.

I drive a Prius. It gets 52 miles per gallon. And how long would it take me to pull my Prius 52 miles?

Another indication, Mr. Speaker, of the incredible energy density in these fossil fuels is the energy density in electricity. You can work very hard in your yard all day long this weekend, and I will get more work out of an electric motor, more mechanical work out of an electric motor with less than 25 cents worth of electricity. Now, it may be kind of humbling to recognize that we are worth less than 25 cents a day in terms of fossil fuels. But that incredible energy density and the really large supply of this energy source resulted in this statement by the Corps of Engineers. Oil is the most important form of energy in the world today.

Historically, no other energy source equals oil's intrinsic qualities of extractability, transportability, versatility and cost. The qualities that enabled oil to take over from coal as a front line energy source for the industrial world in the middle of the 20th century are as relevant today as they were then. Oil is absolutely essential to our way of life.

The next chart notes some very prominent people. Colin Campbell, more than any other person, he probably inherited the mantle from M. King Hubbert, Jean LaHerrere, Brian Fleay, Roger Blanchard, Richard Duncan, Walter Youngquist and Albert Bartlett. Not a relative of mine, but if you go to the web and pull up Albert Bartlett you can get his speech that he has given more than 1,600 times. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I think you will agree with me it is the most interesting 1-hour lecture you will ever hear.

All of these people have estimated that a peak in conventional oil production will occur around 2005. And then they quote some corporations that have reached a similar conclusion.

The next chart is another quote from this very important study by the Corps of Engineers. In general, all nonrenewable resources follow a natural supply curve, just as M. King Hubbert said 50 years ago. Production increases rapidly, slows, reaches a peak and then declines at a rapid pace, similar to its initial increase.

The major question for petroleum is not whether production will peak, but when. There are many estimates. Most of the authorities agree that it is either now or imminent. Very few push it off more than a decade into the future.

The next chart is really interesting. Now, this is dated just last September. The current price of oil is in the $45 to $57 per barrel range. Now it is $70 to $75, a little under $70 today. But it has been in the $70 to $75 range. And it is expected to stay in that range for several years. It is less than a year later and it is now $70 a barrel. They expected it to stay in the range of $45 to $57 a barrel for 7 years. So even the experts have underestimated the relationship between production and consumption.

Oil prices may go significantly higher. Indeed, they have gone up to $75 just a few weeks ago. And some have predicted prices ranging up to $180 a barrel in a few years.

Now, the next chart shows that not everybody agrees with this. And this is a very interesting chart. This is a chart from our Energy Information Agency, and we have had the two top officials of that agency in our office to talk about these subjects. And this is a chart which shows historically what production has been, and it shows what they think the future looks like.

Now, they use a very interesting and, one might say, bizarre use of statistics. In statistics there is a 95 percent probability; that is, you are 95 percent certain about what is going to happen in the future, and then there is a 50 percent probability, which is obviously less certainty about what is going to happen into the future. And then finally, a 5 percent probability. And boy, that is really uncertain. There is just a big, big envelope out there. Could be anything in a broad field.

Well, what they have done in this chart is really very interesting. They have taken the 95 percent probability, which is the yellow line here, and then they have taken the 50 percent probability, which is the green line. But they took the 50 percent probability only on the plus side of the 95 percent probability. You need to draw another green line that is just as far on the other side of the yellow line. Then they draw the blue line there, which is the 5 percent probability, but they should have drawn another one, which is just as far on this side of the yellow. In other words, the 5 percent probability says you are very uncertain about the future. There could be a whole lot more oil in the future, or there could be a whole lot less oil in the future. But they look at only the whole lot more oil in the future.

And then they make a very interesting designation. They say that the 50 percent probability is the mean. The 50 percent probability, Mr. Speaker, has nothing to do with the mean. And I wanted to make certain, and I did have a course in statistics many years ago. I wanted to make certain that I had not forgotten and was misinterpreting this, so we had experts from the Congressional Research Service come over and discuss this with them. And they said that they agreed that this was a very unusual, one might say bizarre, use of statistics.

Well, Mr. Speaker, you see what has happened since they made this prediction. Here they predicted these three different scenarios, the 95 percent probability, the 50 percent probability, which they said was the mean, the most probable. 95 percent probability is

far more probable than 50 percent probability.

But look what reality has been. Look what the red line, look what the actual data points have been. They have been following, as you would suspect they would, the 95 percent probability.

□ 2015

The next chart shows a somewhat expanded application of this use of statistics. A couple of Congresses ago, I was privileged to chair the Energy Subcommittee on Science, and I wanted to determine the dimensions of the problem. So we had the world's experts come in. And they just about all agreed fairly unanimously that we probably had about a thousand gigabarrels of oil remaining in the world, 940 to 1,030, something in that range. Now, we use gigabarrels because, surprisingly, a billion in our country is different than a billion in England. Apparently, a billion in England is a million million. One billion in our country is a thousand million. But everybody knows what a giga is; so we talk about gigabarrels. They now, using what they call the mean, and 50 percent probability, Mr. Speaker, is not the mean, but they say that if that is the mean, then they expect to find roughly another thousand gigabarrels of oil.

Mr. Speaker, even if that is true, this chart shows us a very interesting thing. The black curve here shows the actual production, and we are about at a peak here, and most of the experts believe that it will level off and then fall down, following a curve very much like the upslope here. They believe that there is another thousand gigabarrels of oil out there, roughly, that we are going to find. Eight hundred, roughly, gigabarrels of oil that we are going to find. If that is true, that pushes the peak only to 2016. That is only 10 years from now, Mr. Speaker, even if they are right. And the odds that they are right are very, very small. There is almost nobody else who agrees that this is a proper use of statistics. Even if they are true, it pushes the peak out only 10 years.

In the Hirsch Report, they said that if you did not plan for this peaking at least 20 years ahead that you were going to have rather serious economic consequences of that. Obviously, even if they are right, it is only 10 years ahead; so we do not have 20 years to plan.

This curve shows another very interesting thing, and that is what would happen if you really were very clever and worked very hard and had some breakthroughs so that you could pump the oil more quickly? And what they show there is that that might push the peak out to 2037, roughly another 20 years. But look at the consequences of that, Mr. Speaker. Notice the drop-off. It drops off almost like you have fallen off a cliff. You obviously cannot pump oil that you have not found. And if you pump it now, you cannot pump it later.

Let us read on the next chart what one of the world's experts on energy says about the assumptions that they make here. Now, that was a chart from the Energy Information Agency, but they get their basic data from USGS. And this is what Gene Laherrere says about that: ''The USGS estimate implies a fivefold increase in discovery,'' to give you that, roughly, extra 800, 1,000 gigabarrels of oil, ''and reserve addition for which no evidence is presented. Such an improvement in performance is, in fact, utterly implausible given the great technology achievements of the industry over the past 20 years, the worldwide search and the deliberate effort to find the largest remaining prospects.''

We now are very good. We have computer modeling. We have 3–D seismic, and there is not much quarrel among the world's experts as to how much oil remains and where it will be. The people actually out there looking for oil do not have the wild disagreements that those who are back modeling with computers have who are using what I think is an unusual application of statistics.

The next chart shows us something that Albert Einstein would encourage you to reflect on. He was asked, after he discovered nuclear energy, ''Dr. Einstein, what will be the next great energy force in the world after nuclear energy?'' And his response was that the most powerful force in the universe was the power of compound interest. And that is exponential growth, and these several curves here look at exponential growth. The lower straight line there is not exponential growth. It is 2 percent growth, and you extrapolate that out. In other words, it is like putting your money in the bank and it gets some interest, and every time you get some interest, you take the interest out. That is this growth.

This curve line that starts out at the same place is what happens if you leave your money in the bank and you are getting interest on interest. It gets ever steeper and steeper and steeper because the principal on which you are collecting interest grows and grows and grows.

This is a 4 percent curve. This is a 5 percent curve. And, Mr. Speaker, this is a 10 percent curve. It doubles in 7 years.

A good rule of thumb, by the way, is if you take the rate of growth and divide it into 70, that will give you the doubling time. So 2 percent growth into 70 gives you 35 years doubling time. This, by the way, is almost exactly the rate at which China and India are growing. And they are going to need oil, Mr. Speaker, for that growth.

The next chart is a simple schematic which presents us with several realities that we really need to reflect on. This is the 2 percent growth curve. Now, I can make that growth very steep by compressing the abscissa and expanding the ordinate here. But this is a 2 percent growth curve. That yellow area represents the difference between what you will have if we peak here and what you would like to have because this is demand. That is that 2 percent demand curve from the previous chart. And you see that you actually start to have a deficiency some time before peaking. By the way, that yellow area covers 35 years. We know that because this point is half as high as that point, and that is a 35-year period. It doubles in 35 years.

So most of the world's experts believe that we are at or near peaking. Now, this presents us with a couple of real challenges, Mr. Speaker. We now have no surplus energy to invest in alternatives. Every bit of the oil that we are producing is needed by the world's economies. As a matter of fact, they would like to have more. Because there is hardly enough oil to meet the demands, the price has gone from $10 a barrel just a few years ago to $70 a barrel now. So if we are going to have any energy to invest in alternatives, we are either going to have to find a lot more energy somewhere else, and the next chart will show how unlikely that is, or we are going to have to free up some energy by not using all the energy we are using now. In other words, an aggressive conservation program to push this peak down so that we have a little bit of energy here to invest in alternatives. By the way, that maybe is not a little bit.

Let me give you just one example of this investment. If you build a nuclear power plant, it may take you 10 years to permit and build it. Maybe we can shrink that, and I hope we can, to 5 years. That would be pretty quick, Mr. Speaker, to shrink that to 5 years. Our present nuclear power plants, you must operate them 20 years before you get back the energy that you have put into them. Lots of fossil fuel energy is used in making these nuclear power plants. What that means is that with today's permitting and with today's nuclear power plant efficiencies, it would be 30 years, if you started today, before you would get any net energy. Now, maybe we can do better and shrink the permitting and construction to 5 years, and maybe we can have more efficient nuclear power plants so that it only takes 15 years for payback. But even that, Mr. Speaker, 5 plus 15 is 20 years. What that means is if you started today to build nuclear power plants, it would be 20 years, best case, before you had net energy, and in the meantime you are going to have to get the energy to produce the nuclear power plants by depressing the present use of energy because we do not have any spare energy. There is no surplus energy if, in fact, we are at peak oil. That is what it means. That is peak. There is not going to be any more.

The next chart is a really interesting one and shows essentially the same things here. The bar graphs here show the discovery. And you notice that we made some pretty big discoveries way back in the 1940s, some really big ones in about 1950. And, boy, we really learned how to find oil in the 1960s and

the 1970s. But at about 1980 our discovery of oil became less than our use of oil. The heavy black line here represents the consumption of oil, how much oil we have used. So for all of these years up until we get to about 1980, we are always finding more oil than we use. We use this much of it under the curve, but all this above the curve is now surplus oil. It is reserve oil that we have to use in the future. We have been eating into that reserve since about 1980 because, you see here, we have found just this amount of oil, but we have consumed this amount of oil; so this shaded area in between them represents the amount of the reserves back here that we have used.

Now, you can within limits make the future look about any way you wish, within some very realistic limits. First of all, you have to decide how much more oil you are probably going to find. The world's experts believe that we have probably found about 95 percent of the oil that we are going to find. As a matter of fact, if I was extrapolating and smoothing this curve, I would come out at a lower curve than they would come out at. But that shaded area there, it is not going to be that smooth, obviously. It has never been smooth. It is up and down. But on average they believe that is the kind of oil that we are going to find in the future.

There is one thing that is an absolute certainty. The area under the consumption curve will not be greater than the area under the discovery curve. That is the quantity that you consumed. If you take the area under that curve, that is the total amount that you have consumed. It is like adding up a whole bunch of little bar graphs. That is what we have here is a bunch of bar graphs. And the area under the discovery curve represents the oil that has been discovered. It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot pump what you have not discovered. So if you are going to make the future look much difference than this, you are going to have to make some different assumptions about how much oil you are going to find in the future.

Now, you can get the oil a little more quickly by using some aggressive techniques, enhance the oil recovery by injecting COG, pumping seawater in it. And, by the way, the Saudis are now pumping about almost two-thirds seawater, and they have always pumped some. They flood the periphery of the fields with seawater to push the oil into the center, and then they pump it out, and now they are getting about two-thirds seawater. But never mind. Oil is different from water and separates from water, usually lighter than water; although the heavy crude may not be lighter than water, as the name implies. But it is easily separated from water. So you now, Mr. Speaker, can kind of predict what you think the future will be by looking at this curve, remembering that you cannot pump what you have not found.

I would like to go back for just a moment to the previous chart I showed that shows a challenge that we have, and that is the challenge of the gap. The gap is the difference between what is available and what you would like to use. Now, people have been focusing on filling the gap. I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that for a couple of reasons that ought not be our focus. First of all, I am not sure that we can fill the gap. And, secondly, since there is a finite amount of fossil fuels in the world, if we fill the gap now, there will be less to use later.

I am beginning, Mr. Speaker, to be more and more concerned about a moral element to this discussion. We now are passing on to our children and our grandchildren, not with my vote, but we are now passing on to our children and our grandchildren the largest intergenerational debt transfer in the history of the world. We cannot run our government on current revenues. And we are now going to not only require our children and grandchildren to run their government on current revenues, they are going to have to pay back all of the money that we have borrowed from their generation. Now, Mr. Speaker, should we compound the problems that we are bequeathing to them by pumping now the oil and the gas that they would need to sustain their economy? There is only so much there, Mr. Speaker. If you pump it today, it will not be there tomorrow.

I am opposed to drilling in ANWR, not because of environmental concerns necessarily. I think they do a very good job. They build roads in the winter out of crushed ice. When spring comes, you cannot see where the road was. They have a very small footprint. But, Mr. Speaker, I am having a lot of trouble understanding how it is in our national security interest. If we have only 2 percent of the world's oil and use 25 percent of the world's oil and import two-thirds of what we use, I am having a lot of trouble understanding how it is in our long-term national security interest to pump that little bit of oil we have got as soon as we can. If we could pump ANWR tomorrow, what would we do the day after tomorrow? And the day after tomorrow is when our kids and our grandkids are going to be faced with the necessity of supporting the economy and paying back the enormous amounts of money that we have borrowed from their generation. So I am having a problem, Mr. Speaker, with trying to fill that gap.

The next chart shows us what the SAIC study, the Hirsch Report, suggested as a way to fill the gap.

□ 2030

But notice that if you start now, and zero is now, that you don't have hardly anything for at least 5 years. And then it slowly grows. They are going to fill it with enhanced oil recovery. If we pump it, our kids can't pump it. They are going to fill it with coal liquids. If we use the coal, our kids won't have the coal. They are going to fill it with heavy oil—oil is like the tar sands in Canada and the oil shales in our country—and gas to liquids. If we use those things, our kids aren't going to have those things.

You notice they don't have wind here. They don't have solar there. That is because these now, although they in the future will be enormously important, they provide minuscule contributions now. To ramp those up is going to take more time than they thought was available. And so you could get there quicker in filling the gap with exploiting these finite resources that when they are gone, they are gone.

The only one which is sustainable is efficient vehicles. The average car and light truck is in the fleet about 16 years, the average 18-wheeler for 28 years. And so if you start using more fuel-efficient cars, it takes a long time to turn over that fleet. You notice, they didn't see a thing for about 5 years nearly, and then slowly increasing the contribution that it made.

The next chart, Mr. Speaker, looks at what the options are that we have. Obviously we are going to get our energy from somewhere. As we slide down the other side of Hubbert's Peak, the world will be looking for energy from other sources.

What will they be? Well, we have listed here, at least generically I think, all of the potential sources. We have some finite resources: the tar sands, the oil shales, coal, nuclear, two kinds of fission and fusion.

Just a word about the tar sands. Canada calls them oil sands. It is really tar. Its quality is little better than the asphalt parking lot out here which, by the way, if you put a blowtorch on it will flow. They now are mining that with shovels that have 100 tons in one shovel, dump it in a truck that hauls 400 tons and then they cook it, heat it up, to get the oil out.

You are told a lot of things, Mr. Speaker, and what we really need is an honest broker so that we can have facts that we agree on. I don't know whether this is true or not, but I am told that they are using more energy from stranded gas; stranded gas is gas where there is nobody nearby to use it and it is hard to ship so it is very cheap when it is stranded. They are using more energy from natural gas than they are getting out of the oil that they produce.

Dollarwise, it's a good bet. Eighteen dollars a barrel to produce it. They're getting $70. That is really a moneymaker. But in terms of energy-profit ratio, it obviously wouldn't be something that you would want to do indefinitely. The oil shales in our country are very difficult to exploit. Shell Oil Company has been there. It will be 2013, they tell us, before they will even decide whether it is economically feasible to get that oil. There is an incredible amount of oil there, more reserves there than all of the Middle East. But there is probably also more energy in

the tides than all the oil energy in the Middle East, but because it is so diffuse, it is difficult to get out and that is kind of the problem with these tar sands and oil shales. Ultimately we will get them out, but we are not going to get them out in large enough quantities quick enough to fill that gap.

Coal. Let's put the next one up, then I will come back to this. I just want to talk about coal for just a moment, because many people will tell you not to worry about the future because we have got 250 years of coal out there. That is true; 250 years at current use rates. But, Mr. Speaker, you remember those exponential curves we showed and what happens with exponential growth. Albert Einstein says it's the most powerful force in the universe. If you increase your use of coal only 2 percent, and I will submit that when oil starts running down, we are going to increase the use of coal far more than 2 percent to make up that difference. By the way, it is pretty easy to liquefy it with a Fischer-Tropsch technique. Hitler used it. We denied him access to oil, which is, by the way, one of the reasons that he went to a second front in Russia that lost him the war, because he was running out of coal. He needed Russian oil, so he went to that second front in Russia.

With a 2 percent growth, that 250 years now shrinks to about 85 years. But you can't fill the trunk of your car with coal, so if you are going to make a liquid of it or a gas of it, you are going to have to use some energy to do that. So now that shrinks to 50 years. So we have got 50 years of coal left, with only a 2 percent increase in growth if you are going to convert it to a gas or a liquid. By the way, with either a big economic penalty for cleaning it up or a big environmental penalty if you don't clean it up, because almost all the coal we have left in our country and in the world, for that matter, is pretty dirty coal with high sulfur. The good clean stuff we have pretty much used.

Now back to the first chart we were looking at, which goes through the other things that we might use. These are the finite resources. They are there. You need to husband them and use them wisely. We could go to nuclear lightwater reactors, the kind we have now. There is a big argument, by the way, as to whether we ought to go to more nuclear or not. Twenty percent of all of our electricity, 8 percent of our total energy but 20 percent of our electricity is produced by nuclear. In France, that is about 85 percent produced by nuclear. You can either have the lightwater reactors, but there is a finite amount of fissionable uranium in the world, so by and by we will go to breeder reactors, of which we have none. And in transporting that stuff and enriching it, you produce some bomb-grade materials and so you have to be very careful with that. You buy some problems with it. But breeder reactors are what the name implies, breeder reactors, and they make more fuel than they may use.

Then there is fusion. Mr. Speaker, if we get there, we're home free. The analogy I use is if you think you're going to solve your personal economic problems by winning the lottery, then we are probably going to solve our energy problems with fusion. I think the odds are about the same. That doesn't keep me from supporting that. We put about $250 million a year in it. I would vote more if there were more capability out there, because it is the only energy source for the future where we are really home free. So we need to explore it, but I wouldn't bet the ranch that we're going to get there.

Then we have the truly renewable resources. They now are pretty much in the noise level. Solar. Today, 1 percent. That is up. It is growing. It grew 60 percent last year.

Wind. I think that grew about 35 percent last year.

Geothermal. That is real geothermal, tapping down into the molten core of the Earth and getting water that is close enough to there that it is hot. There is not a chimney in Iceland, I think, because they have enough geothermal power.

Ocean energy. A lot of energy there. The tides, the waves, ocean thermal gradients. But it is very diffuse. Very hard to harness. We are trying. We need to do more there.

Agricultural resources. Soy diesel, biodiesel, ethanol, methanol, biomass. In a couple of moments we will come back to talk a little more about those and what confidence you ought to have that they are going to make a really big contribution to our energy supply.

Waste energy is a really good one. That is burning trash instead of burying it out there. There are places doing that. We have a great facility up here in Montgomery County at Dickerson. They will be happy to show you that. It really is very current state of the art.

Hydrogen from renewables. Just a quick word about hydrogen. Hydrogen, Mr. Speaker, is not an energy source. We will always use more energy producing hydrogen than we get out of hydrogen. Else, we will have to suspend the second law of thermodynamics and if we can do that, we can suspend gravity, and then we have lots of opportunities. Always we will use more energy producing the hydrogen than we get out of it.

So why should we even bother? For two reasons. One is when you finally burn it, you get only water. That is really not a pollutant. The second reason is that if we are ever able to perfect economically supportable fuel cells, hydrogen is very convenient to use in a fuel cell.

I drove a fuel cell car the other day. We had an energy-efficient car showcase out in Frederick, Maryland. The major manufacturers came out there and brought their cars. I drove a fuel cell car. It cost a million dollars. The fuel cell will last a couple of hundred hours. We are working on fuel cells, but it will be a while before we get there. But if we get there, and I think we will, then they have at least twice the efficiency of the reciprocating engine. That is why we look at hydrogen. It is not a savior. It will help.

The next chart looks at ethanol. This is an interesting chart. It shows on the top that you need about 1.23 million Btus of fossil fuel energy to get 1 million Btus in the tank of your car. Obviously it takes energy to drill a hole and pump it out and refine it and transport it and so forth.

This slide looks at energy from corn, from ethanol. This is about as good as we will ever get. Many people tell me this is wildly optimistic, but I think we can get there. What this says is that to get 1 million Btus of ethanol energy, you have got to put in .74, three-fourths as many Btus as you get out. What that means, Mr. Speaker, is that every gallon of ethanol that you burn in your car represents three-fourths of a gallon of fossil fuel that it took to make the ethanol. So a gallon of ethanol doesn't offset a gallon of gasoline. If you make ethanol from corn, 13 percent of our corn crop will produce enough ethanol to displace 2 percent of our gasoline. But you have used a lot of fossil fuel energy producing, growing the corn.

This little chart at the bottom shows the energy input in producing a bushel of corn. The big purple slice here, 40-odd percent, is nitrogen fertilizer which today is made from natural gas. Mr. Speaker, I suspect there is almost nobody off the farm who knows that when they are eating broccoli that they are eating recycled natural gas, because that is where the nitrogen came from to grow the broccoli.

These are all the other energy inputs from oil. Planting it, harvesting, building the tractor, making the tires for the tractor.

If we were going to grow corn with the energy from corn, using that, 13 percent of the corn crop would replace 2 percent of our gasoline. We would have to double our corn crop and use all of it for ethanol if we were going to replace just 10 percent of our gasoline.

Mr. Speaker, this gives you something of the dimensions of the problem that we face. There is a lot of talk about ethanol. Brazil makes a lot of it from sugar cane. It is more efficient than corn. You use the whole stock rather than just the kernel and they don't use much fossil fuel energy. You see people down there planting it by hand, harvesting it by hand, and so forth. So they do not have anywhere near the fossil fuel energy input into their ethanol that we have.

By the way, we will never make ethanol from sugar cane in our country because sugar is so high. I don't know how expensive gasoline would have to be before we could afford to make ethanol from sugar, and that is what it is made from. It is made by fermenting sugar.

I have a really interesting analogy that helps us understand this chart. We are very much in our country like a young couple that has gotten married and their grandparents have died and they have a big inheritance and they have now established a lavish lifestyle, where 85 percent of the money they spend comes from their grandparents' inheritance and only 15 percent from their income; but their income is going to give out before they retire so they have obviously got to do something. They have got to make more or spend less. That is exactly where we are. Eighty-five percent of our energy, some people say 86, 85 percent of our energy comes from natural gas, petroleum, and coal and only 15 percent from other sources.

□ 2045

A bit more than half of that comes from nuclear. That could and maybe should grow. We need to talk about the pros. By the way, I have friends who were devoutly anti-nuclear. These were bright people.

But when they considered the alternative, which may be shivering in the dark, nuclear is beginning to look better. Seven percent of the total, and this is year 2000, we are a little better than that today, but only 1 percent of 7 percent, that is .07 percent. That is a trifling amount that came from solar. That has been growing.

Last year it was maybe 60, so now it is not up to .07 percent, but maybe it is 1 percent. But it is still a very small amount. Wood, that is the paper industry and timber industry wisely using a waste product that probably is not available to the rest of us and probably can't grow much to maintain our woodlands. Waste energy that ought to go and could go.

Wind again, 1 percent, that has grown some. That is 1 percent of 7 percent, by the way. It has to get seven times bigger, to be 1 percent of a whole thing. Congressional hydroelectric, that is not going to grow in our country. Micro-hydro might.

China is really exploding in their use of micro-hydro. That is using little streams where you probably don't have the environmental impact that you probably do in the large streams. That could grow in our country. We have not even begun to exploit that here.

Down here is agriculture, alcohol, fuel. That was about 20.07 percent. That is more now. That is growing, but still is very small compared to the total amount of energy used.

Then geothermal. The next chart shows something really challenging. The next chart shows the challenge we have of being more efficient. Most energy you get out of an incandescent bulb is heat. That is the blue here, the dark blue. The light is this little bit on top. Now to get the same amount of light from a fluorescent, you produce only this much heat. But look what happens when you go to a light emitting diode. This is the light that is the heat.

If you think, that is why if you buy an LED flashlight you will forget when you put the batteries in it, because they will last so long compared to the length of time they last, where with the conventional incandescent bulb, what, 90 percent of the energy goes to heat.

The next chart shows an interesting one. I wanted to show this, because many people say not to worry, the market will take care of it. There are many market worshippers out there who believe that the market is both omniscient and omnipotent.

This is a little example of what has happened in this market. This was the oil price by hike that didn't produce any commensurate increase in production of oil. It is because it just wasn't there.

The market will work if there are infinite resources. Mr. Speaker, there are not infinite resources here. The next chart shows that you can live on less and live well. The average Californian only uses about 65 percent of the energy of the rest of us. That is because of the many regulations they have out there with more demand, efficiency.

The next chart shows a very interesting one. This shows a satisfaction with life. This shows satisfaction with life relative to a GDP. Here we are. We have the highest GDP. But we don't have the highest satisfaction with life.

There are a dozen countries that have a much smaller GDP per capita, who are happier with life than we are. It is obvious that you can be happy using less energy than we use.

The next chart is one that just is stunning when you first see it. This is a history of the world. Only of 5,000 years recorded, this is the last 400. We entered industrial age, wood, coal, appropriately black, and then gas and oil.

Look what happened with gas and oil. It just explodes. It is standing on its end. By the way, the population followed that. Half a billion to a billion people here, nearly 7 billion people there.

Now, it will come down the other side as fast as it has gone up that side. What will we do? The age of oil will be about another 100, 150 years, and then we will be through the age of oil.

The next and last chart shows what we have got to do. We have got to buy time. We must depress our use of energy efficiency conservation so we have some energy to invest in alternatives and some time in which to do it. Then we must use it wisely. We need something equivalent of DARPA. ARPA–E is a suggestion, some organization that looks at that time energy we have got and the resources we have got. What is the best bet. Where could we use it to get the most good.

There will be a number of benefits in that. America could again become the industrial capital of the world. We could be exporting this technology. Whether we like it or not, we are a role model. We are one person out of 22. We use 25 percent of the world's energy. I genuinely believe that if Americans understood the problem they face today they would rise to the challenge.

I lived through World War II. Everybody was involved. I believe we are creative and innovative, and we can solve this problem. I think you could sleep really good when you went to bed tonight, recognizing you used less energy today than you were yesterday, and you were happier today than you were yesterday.

We need to face this challenge. We will face it. I think the earlier we face it, the better off we will be.

THE IRAQI WAR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight as a Democratic member of the House Armed Services Committee to try to place the upcoming debate we will have tomorrow on the Iraqi war resolution into context.

It is very important that people realize that we do not get to vote on general ideas here in Congress. We get to vote on specific pieces of legislation. The case tomorrow will be H. Res. 861. I encourage not only our colleagues here, but folks across America, to look this up on the Internet and see what you think of it.

My guess is, and while there are many varied opinions on this controversial war, my guess is that when you actually read the resolution, you will find that there is remarkably little in it that is controversial.

Now, you know that resolutions are primarily composed of whereas clauses, which have really no effect, and then there are a few resolved clauses. In this resolution, you will find that there are only seven resolved clauses. Let me read them to you.

They say, resolved that the House of Representatives one, honors all those Americans who have taken an active part in the global war on terror, whether as first responders protecting the homeland, as service Members overseas, as diplomats and intelligence officers or in other roles.

That, to me, is uncontroversial. We must praise our troops.

Point two, we honor the sacrifices of the United States Armed Forces and of the partners in the coalition and of the Iraqis and Afghans who fought alongside them, especially those who have fallen or have been wounded in the struggle, and we honor as well the sacrifice of their families and of others who risked their lives to help defend freedom.

Who is against that?

Point three, we declare that it is not in the national security interest of the United States to set an arbitrary date for the withdrawal or redeployment of U.S. Armed Forces from Iraq.

Now, while that point can be controversial among some individuals, no

Member of this House wants to do anything to give our terrorist foes an advantage. So it is very important that we realize that even this point, number three, I think, if seen in the proper light, is pretty uncontroversial.

Point four, we declare that the United States is committed to the completion of the mission to create a sovereign, free, secure and united Iraq. That to me means that Iraq will no longer be a haven of terrorists. It will no longer be a play thing for a brutal dictator like Saddam Hussein. So that to me is another point that should be uncontroversial.

Point five, we congratulate Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki and the Iraqi people on the courage they have shown by participating and increasing millions in the elections of 2005 and on the formation of the first government under Iraq's new constitution.

I think all Americans were impressed to see some 70 percent of the eligible Iraqi population braving gunfire, braving bullets in order to go vote. I wish we had that level of participation in our own country.

Point six, the resolution calls on the nations of the world to promote global peace and security by standing with the United States and other coalition partners to support the efforts of the Iraqi and Afghan people to live in freedom.

Who is against that?

Finally, point seven, we declare that the United States will prevail in the global war on terror, the noble struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary.

This is a resolution we will debate for some 10 hours tomorrow. I think when you get down to it, there is really very little that is controversial about it. But the context is somewhat controversial, because under the rules of debate tomorrow we will not be allowed to amend or change this document in any way. We will be required to accept it as if it were perfect. Every American has suggestions for change.

There are many ways, countless ways that this document could be made better, but we will not be allowed to consider any of those, because under the procedures laid down by the Republican majority they do not want to hear any alteration to this document.

That is one flaw in the debate we will have tomorrow. Another is that this is really not a debate about how best to win the war on terrorism. This is more of a public relations campaign 3 years into a very controversial war designed to try to make the administration look better.

I am not against any administration trying to improve its public image. But for the safety of our troops, this debate is 3 or 4 years late.

I had the privilege of serving in this House during the first Iraq war, and that debate went down in history under the first President Bush as one of the best debates in modern American history. But that was under the first President Bush.

That first conflict, which followed the rules of the Powell Doctrine of defending an explicit American interest of going in with overwhelming force and having a clear exit strategy, sadly, in this conflict, the Powell Doctrine was not followed, even though General Powell was second as Secretary of State of the George W. Bush administration during the onset of this war.

That is another clear difference from the Iraqi war of the past and another clear flaw in this debate that this resolution will be debated several years late. In a sense this is going to be a debate that is unworthy of our troops, because some 2,500 Americans have already died, almost 20,000 are casualties. Now, the House of Representatives is getting around to having a debate on the war in Iraq, a debate that allows no amendment, no change. We have to accept this as if it were perfect.

There is another lesson that we should take into account, because you know that those who do not remember history are doomed to repeat it. I almost wish we could repeat the experience in the first Iraq war, because under the first President Bush he was so persuasive with a broad coalition of partners around the world that of the $60- to $80 billion cost of that war, the American taxpayer only had to pay for about $2- to $4 billion, $2- to $4 billion, the total cost of the first Iraq war to the American taxpayer. Why? Because our allies were so eager to bear the burden of cost of the war, the first Iraq war.

Now, of course, we are involved in a conflict which has already cost a minimum of $350 billion, but according to other estimates, more likely $450 billion, and it looks as if it is headed towards $1 trillion, and almost all of that burden is put on the backs of the American taxpayer.

Allied contributions verge on the negligible. You may remember that Jim Baker, former Secretary of State, former Secretary of Treasury, was sent around the world to collect contributions from allies.

Well, where is the money? Show me the money? Our allies have put up a few billion dollars, but the American taxpayer has been required to shoulder the burden of this war. Of course, running massive budget deficits, as the George W. Bush administration has been doing, effectively we have been borrowing much of the cost of the war from foreign nations.

□ 2100

Increasingly Nations like China, increasingly Nations that are oil rich like Saudi Arabia, Iran, Venezuela, Nations like that are seeking to reinvest petro dollars.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, does that make America stronger when we are increasingly dependent on foreign lenders, many of which are not our allies but may, in fact, be adversary? Does that make us a stronger, better Nation?

Mr. Speaker, in the first Iraq War we were very careful not to damage the American military. Our troops went in for a limited purpose, with an overwhelming number, and exited in a very safe and prompt fashion. That is not the policy today, even though President George W. Bush is the son of the first President Bush.

So, all of these changes should worry us, especially those men and women in uniform, because I am an advocate of letting the military be the military. We have never had a finer fighting force than the one we have today. It is an all-volunteer force. Our men and women in uniform are terrifically capable. It is incredible the challenges that they have met and overcome, oftentimes without the help of their superiors, because especially their civilian superiors in this war consistently underestimated the threat that our troops faced.

When our troops first went in, they were told that they might face a few Baathists dead-enders, and of course, our civilian leaders disbanded the Iraqi military, created all sorts of extra problems for our troops. We could not even control looting in Baghdad, the major city in Iraq.

So, soon, disorder prevailed, and pretty soon we were on the verge of an insurgency that our civilian leadership in the Pentagon was claiming it was really not much of a problem. Victory was always around the corner. The President appeared on an aircraft carrier and declared that the mission was accomplished.

Well, that was, at best, premature. Now we are hoping and praying the Nation of Iraq is not on the verge of civil war, and let us not forget Afghanistan, where we have a smaller troop commitment that is still a vital one, and as the NATO forces try to take over from our men and women in uniform, we should be very much concerned because the Taliban seems to be on the rise.

General Barry McCaffrey just returned from Afghanistan and briefed us last week and said that the Taliban fighters were better equipped than the NATO forces, better equipped, in some cases, than the American forces. Well, where is the Taliban getting all its money? Probably from the drug trade because Afghanistan, as most observers are aware, has once again become one of the leading drug exporting countries in the world. Their poppy production has exploded. We have done very little, if anything, about it, and that is financing not only the Taliban but other forms of illicit terrorist behavior, not only in that country but around the world.

So, Mr. Speaker, this debate comes to us in a tough context. It makes it hard for men and women of goodwill to focus on the text of this resolution, as praiseworthy as it is. It also makes it difficult for some Members to acknowledge with a joyful heart the good news that we have received recently in Iraq.

All Americans should be pleased that we have caught and killed Zarqawi, one of the most notorious terrorists in the

history of the world, a man who reveled in beheadings of innocent people, who killed fellow Muslims with abandon, all to promote his warped ideology, his non-Islamic ideology.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of being in Baghdad the day that we caught Saddam Hussein. That was a high point in the war in Iraq. That was a moment at which our troops were filled with hope and anticipation that the conflict would not last for many, many years. That the Baathist deadenders and other Saddam supporters would quickly turn toward more peaceful pursuits.

But sadly, as we know now, we were not ready for what came afterwards. We were not prepared for a franchising or spreading of the terrorist threat. Some people view it as a nationalist threat. Perhaps it is a tribal threat. There certainly are serious divisions between the Kurds, Sunnis and the Shiias, but we should be prepared this time for whatever follows the capture and death of Zarqawi because there are many other enemies in that country who would love to exploit any weakness that they see in the American forces.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on. I see that my colleague from the Intelligence Committee has joined us here tonight, and I do not want to rush him into this, but I welcome Mr. RUPPERSBERGER'S participation in this debate. He is an outstanding Member of this body and of the Intelligence Committee which is, of course, privy to our Nation's deepest secrets.

So he bears that position with distinction and honor, and I welcome Mr. RUPPERSBERGER to comment at this point.

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

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague Mr. COOPER for yielding this time to me.

I just returned from my fourth visit to Iraq with Speaker HASTERT and two other Members of Congress, and after this recent trip, I am more convinced than ever that the time has come to change U.S. strategy in Iraq.

The ultimate goal is to establish a free, open and democratic Iraqi government and bring our men and women in uniform home.

I believe the best way to do this is to have the Iraqi security forces, specifically the Iraqi Army and military, take on responsibility of patrolling and securing their own country. I believe we must move American and coalition troops to the perimeter of the urban areas and let the Iraqi military patrol the streets of their cities.

Since the invasion of Iraq in March 2003, more than 2,400 American troops have been killed and more than 20,000 injured. The insurgents and al Qaeda are using IEDs, which are roadside bombs, and suicide bombers. We, at this point, have not been able to defend our military as we should because of these tactics.

I believe a change in strategy in Iraq is now necessary. By moving our troops to the perimeter, it will accomplish numerous things. Number one, it will allow the Iraqi military to be less dependent on the American military and our other coalition forces. It will send a message to the Iraqi people that now they have a new government that has been formed, it will give them the message that this is their country, this is their government, and this is also their Iraqi citizens providing their security.

By moving to the perimeter, it will also allow us to change strategy, to show the Iraqi people and the American people and the world that there is a change in strategy, that we are moving ahead and that the Iraqi people and the Iraqi military will now have less dependence on us.

In order for the Iraqi military to be able to provide the security necessary, we must cut the apron strings. By going to the perimeter, we will be able to do that.

Now, how will we be able to do that? Number one, this is the beginning step to bringing our troops home. We will also continue to backup the Iraqi military when they need help. If they are being overrun, they can contact us. You can be anywhere, and many of us who have been to Iraq know, in a Black Hawk helicopter in Baghdad, as an example, within 10 to 15 minutes.

We have the best special operations forces in the world. Our SEAL teams, our rangers, our marines, we have the best in the world. They have the ability to backup the Iraqi military when they are in need.

But this will also allow our American forces to start using our technology, our air power, our abilities that have made us the strongest country in the world to backup the Iraqi military, but it will also, by doing this, going to the perimeter, it will allow us to be able to focus on high-value targets and let us again start bringing our men and women home.

It will not be necessary anymore for our military to patrol the Iraqi urban areas and get blown up or injured by suicide bombers or roadside bombs because the Iraqi military will now be in those same streets.

This is a very important plan. It is something we should consider very strongly.

Now, it is important that we get our information from our military to make sure that we move forward with this type of plan. I was in Iraq about 2 months ago, and I talked to four of the generals who are really in charge of running everyday operations in Iraq, starting with General Casey, and I asked them, is the Iraqi military ready to start taking on the responsibility of patrolling the urban areas. Their comments to me 2 months ago was that they feel that they are getting close, that they are not ready yet.

When I just came back a week ago, when I went to Iraq with the Speaker, I asked the same generals, how are we doing now, is the Iraqi military, who we have trained for two-and-a-half years, is the Iraqi military ready to take on responsibility of patrolling the urban areas. They said to me, basically, they feel that the Iraqi military could take on responsibility of patrolling at least 70 percent of the urban areas. If this is the case, then it is extremely important and urgent almost that we let the Iraqi military start doing the job, and we will then back them up.

Now, after I came back from Iraq, we were asked by President Bush to come and to brief him about the issues and what our observations were. I explained to the President a month-and-a-half ago about my strategy of moving to the perimeter. He said he would consider that.

When I brought up the issue this time about a week ago, his comment was it could be a good idea but he has to rely on his military, on the strategy of his military commanders, and I understand that. And I told him that my conversation with the military commanders in the presence of other Members of Congress was basically they felt they could start the process of letting the Iraqi military starting to patrol the streets, starting to implement this perimeter plan, which will, again, allow the Iraqi military to start providing the security in their country. It will allow us to start bringing troops home, because if we go to the perimeter, we will not need all of the men and women, our military, to patrol the urban areas. Yet, we will still be there in the perimeter, it would be the green zone, to backup the Iraqi military when in need.

I think this strategy should be considered. I hope it will be considered, and by considering this strategy, it will change our mission. It will be a new strategy. It will say to the American people, it is not the same old-same old, and we know that the American people are getting pretty frustrated when they see in the media every day that men and women are being injured, our men and women are being injured or being killed.

This will then allow us to fight the war on our terms, using our air power, our intelligence to be able to go after the high-value targets like Zarqawi and also to fight the war on terror, because we are in a war against terror, not only in Iraq and Afghanistan but throughout the world, and we must focus and use our specialty and our expertise to fight this war on terror.

Remember, our ultimate goal is to turn this government over to the Iraqi people. Let them start creating job. Let us help them create jobs. Let us start helping them deal with the issue of infrastructure. If you do not have a job, you are not going to have a community, and we have to show to the Iraqi people that their quality of life is better under a democracy than it was under Saddam Hussein, but in order to do this, they must have security. They

must have jobs, and I think we can help them do this.

Our ultimate goal is to bring our men and women in uniform home. This perimeter plan is the first step. I respect Congressman MURTHA. I think Congressman MURTHA put this issue on the table so that we in this country and in Congress could start debating the issue about what is the appropriate strategy. My only issue with respect to Congressman MURTHA's issue about a time certain is that I do not believe that we should give any enemy a time certain on when we are going to leave Iraq or Afghanistan, but I do believe that this perimeter strategy is first step to bringing the troops home.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for his great contribution to the debate, and his proposal is just one of the many ideas that could and should be considered by the House of Representatives.

This is a deliberative body. The debate tomorrow will allow us to focus on only one proposal that was drafted in a secretive, partisan fashion that does not allow ideas like Mr. RUPPERSBERGER's to be considered.

□ 2115

I think if you look at the debate, you will find that the folks who are most short-changed in it are probably our own troops.

I mentioned earlier that the debate will not be worthy of them because the debate is occurring some 3 years late, after 2,500 of them have already been killed in service to our country and another 20,000 wounded, many of them grievously. We should have focused on this earlier.

I was not in Congress when the decision was made to go into this Iraqi conflict, although I was here for the vote on the earlier one, and I think it is important that we hear the voice of our troops and of our military commanders. In many ways, these are the voices that have not been heard because, in many cases, they have been drowned out by the civilian leadership in the Pentagon. That civilian leadership, particularly the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Rumsfeld, and the former Under Secretary, Paul Wolfowitz, have systematically disregarded military advice.

Not only did these two gentlemen consistently underestimate the threat, oftentimes, as General Schwarzkopf, the great commander of the first Iraqi war pointed out, they seem to be enjoying their jobs too much. War is serious business, and I think it is time that we hear or at least read the comments of several of our Nation's top generals right now and see their reaction to Mr. Rumsfeld.

At the top of this poster you see Lieutenant General Greg Newbold say that ''What we are living now is the consequence of successive policy failures.'' Mr. Newbold was top Operations Officer of the Joint Staff, Commanding General of the 1st Marine Division, a recipient of the Legion of Merit, the Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medals.

Look at the comment from Major General Paul Eaton. ''Two-and-a-half more years of that leadership was too long for my Nation and too long for my army and for my family.'' General Eaton led the initial effort to create an Iraqi army. He was Commander of the Coalition Military Assistance Training Team, Commanding General of the Army Infantry School.

Look at the comment from Lieutenant General John Riggs. ''They only need the military advice when it satisfies their agenda. Well, that is not paying proper respect to the professionalism and the valor of our military. When you ignore military advice or use it for your own political purposes, it is betraying the military.''

General Riggs was the Director, Objective Task Force, Commanding General of the 1st U.S. Army, and served six tours overseas.

General Wesley Clark said, ''They pressed for open warfare before diplomacy was finished. It was a tragic mistake. It was a strategic blunder.''

Look at the comments from additional generals. Major General John Batiste. ''Rumsfeld and his team turned what should have been a deliberate victory in Iraq into a prolonged challenge.'' He was the commander of the 1st Division in Iraq, the Chief Military Aid to Paul Wolfowitz and a Brigade Commander in Bosnia.

Look at this comment from General Anthony Zinni. ''Rumsfeld has committed acts of gross negligence and incompetence.'' General Zinni is a former CENTCOM commander. That is the regional command there. One of the most experienced men in the region, and a man whose advice was systematically disregarded by this administration. General Zinni was the recipient of the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star, and other distinguished awards, including the Distinguished Service Medal.

I happened to visit General Swannack when I was on my first visit to Iraq. He is the former Commander of the 82nd Airborne Division in Iraq. We met in Ramadi, one of the tough towns in the Sunni Triangle. Listen to what General Swannack has to say. ''I do not believe Secretary Rumsfeld is the right person to fight that war based on his absolute failures in managing the war against Saddam in Iraq.''

That is a vote of no confidence from one of Secretary Rumsfeld's top commanders.

Look at this comment from Lieutenant General Paul Van Riper. ''If I was the President, I would have relieved him from duty 3 years ago.'' General Van Riper is the first President of the Marine Corps University, wounded in action in Vietnam, and a Silver Star recipient and other awards.

You know, Secretary Rumsfeld makes no secret of the fact that he has offered to resign twice and the President has not accepted his resignation. Well, I am proud of Secretary Rumsfeld for having offered to resign, because certainly great blunders have been made. But he has been very reluctant to admit any of those publicly. Perhaps he admitted them to the President.

It is important to realize that Secretary Rumsfeld knew early on in this conflict that he was not really prepared for the job. In a famous leaked October 2003 memo Secretary Rumsfeld himself said something along these lines, that ''He did not have the metrics to understand whether we were winning or losing the war against terrorism,'' but he did know that we were losing the cost-benefit equation; that the terrorists were effectively being able to use $80 IEDs to blow up $2 million tanks and take the lives not only of Americans but of surrounding Iraqis.

So this is an amazing moment. Here we are 3 years later. I have asked Secretary Rumsfeld periodically in hearings something along the lines of every 2 or 3 months, ''Mr. Secretary, in October of 2003, after the war had begun, you said you did not have the metrics to understand whether we were winning or losing the war on terrorism. Do you have those metrics today?'' Well, I haven't ever heard a good answer to that question.

So I trust our military leaders. I trust our men and women in uniform at all ranks, because so often today in this conflict the folks who have the most combat experience are not the generals in the Pentagon, they are the colonels, the majors, the captains, the lieutenants, the sergeants, and the privates in the field.

And with the advent of advanced military communications, in some cases the plain old Internet, there has been a lot of contact and communication between those officers and enlisted men to find out the best techniques, the best way to pacify a town, the best way to engage in nation-building and get the infrastructure up and going again, the best way to use commander emergency funds, to help employ Iraqis and get the water turned on, get the electricity working, and things like that. But it has been a surprisingly ad hoc effort.

We are the greatest nation on earth. We are the greatest nation in the history of the world. And one of the primary reasons for that is the brilliance and the dedication of our troops. We have a fighting force like the world has never seen before. It is the most forceful group of warriors, the most humane group of warriors, and the most ethical group of warriors ever. And we should appreciate that. We should be grateful for that, because we would not be able to take a breath of freedom without their vigilance for our country.

Too many of us forget that our men and women in uniform are posted in 120 nations around the world every day and every night on lookout to protect our freedom. I repeat, 120 nations around the world. Most Americans, even with an atlas, could not even

name those nations. Not only are our soldiers making a terrific sacrifice for us, their families are, their loved ones back home, and we should never, never let a day go by without praying for them and showing our deepest heartfelt appreciation for their sacrifice.

I wish our leaders in the Pentagon would listen to them more, because our men and women in uniform on the front lines of freedom know more about the terrorist adversary than the folks in the Pentagon and know more about tactics and procedures for best dealing with the terrorists. And if as my friend Mr. Ruppersberger said, his proposal for perimeter defense makes sense to those military leaders, then I would hope our civilian leaders in the Pentagon would listen as well.

We have had a lot of controversy because early on in the Iraq war many of our top military leaders said we needed far more troops to go in and work with the Iraqis in order to preserve security so that the nation could be rebuilt. General Shinseki, Eric Shinseki, was probably the leading proponent of that approach. In a Senate hearing he was asked how many troops it would take, and he said a couple hundred thousand. He was retired early for having told the truth, and no leader in the Pentagon attended his retirement ceremony; a clear snub in military culture.

You didn't see General Shinseki's name on this chart because he has been too tight-lipped to really blast the folks who mistreated him in such a grievous fashion, and mistreated him for what? For having told the truth. For having admitted publicly that it would take a couple hundred thousand troops to do the job right.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of Americans don't realize that not only do we have troops posted in 120 nations around the world right now, but our troops are under great stress. In military terms, they call it OPTEMPO. Our troops have the highest OPTEMPO now than our troops have had since World War II. That means greater stress than during Vietnam and greater stress than during Korea. Our troops are stretched pretty thin right now.

Most Americans don't realize that just a short while ago in Iraq, when Tennessee's own 278th Guard unit was there in Iraq, in country, that half or more of the active duty troops in the country were in fact National Guardsmen, what some people view as weekend warriors. These men and women from back home, who are not full-time active-duty soldiers, were called up for tours of duty for 6 months, a year, or more to serve their country in the sandy desert, tough climate, of Iraq. They went willingly, without carping, to serve our Nation.

I am from the Volunteer State, Mr. Speaker. We earned that reputation in many of our Nation's conflicts because when duty called, our men and women back home didn't have to be asked twice to serve. They took their rifle, their horse, whatever they had with them and volunteered for duty. That spirit survives today.

It also survives in the independence of Specialist Wilson, who asked Secretary Rumsfeld that famous question in Iraq about why National Guardsmen had to go scrounging around in garbage dumps to find metal to attach to the Humvees in order to try to protect themselves driving down Iraqi highways. Secretary Rumsfeld, you will recall, was somewhat startled by that question. But Specialist Wilson, a Tennessee guardsman, got more reaction from Secretary Rumsfeld, got more response in terms of really armoring our Humvees and other vehicles in Iraq than the House Armed Services Committee was able to accomplish.

So I am proud of Specialist Wilson's courage, not only in serving his country but in speaking truth to power. Secretary Rumsfeld clearly didn't like to hear what he was saying, but it finally got our military industrial complex working a little harder to up-armor our Humvees, to provide the bullet-proofed vests, and other things that our troops lacked for so, so many months and years in the Iraqi conflict. Why? Because our civilian leadership persistently underestimated the threat.

So all I would ask, Mr. Speaker, is that the upcoming debate tomorrow, the 10 hours, be conducted in a civil fashion, bearing in mind the relatively innocuous text that has been put before us; bearing in mind that the Republican leadership must feel insecure. Even though they command an absolute majority in this House, even though they command the Senate as well, and even though they control the White House, they must feel so insecure that they would not allow any amendment to this resolution.

The context, Mr. Speaker, is that we face a heavily divided country on this issue. The House gave this war such a cursory debate when it was undertaken that most Americans were unprepared, as in fact the civilian leadership of the Pentagon was unprepared, for the length, the duration, the toughness, and the cost of the conflict.

□ 2130

Now there were many people in our government who knew better. Secretary Colin Powell was one, the four-star general who commanded our troops in the first Iraq war, but he was plainly not listened to.

Many other experts in government, experts in nation-building, knew this would be a tough and long struggle. But the Vice President, Mr. CHENEY, Secretary Rumsfeld and others insisted on, created several illusions: One, that we would be greeted as liberators, toasted, greeted with flowers, and that Iraqi oil revenues would somehow pay for the conflict.

Well, that plainly did not happen. Now we are faced with a situation where we are indeed proud of the bravery and valor of our troops, but the administration is still unwilling to pay their bills. Until very recently, there was no money in the regular budget to pay for the war in Iraq. It was always an emergency supplemental. Everything was unexpected. Now, finally, the administration seems to be getting a little more realistic and they are at least willing to call it, as Secretary Rumsfeld said, the long hard slog or the long, long war.

We can get through this. We have overcome all of our adversities in the past. We are the greatest Nation on Earth and the greatest Nation in the history of the world; but we owe that greatness in large measure to our troops, the men and women in uniform, and not too much to our civilian leadership in Washington. In many cases they have not acted in a way to honor our troops.

One of the best ways to honor our troops is to listen to their good advice. In so many cases our military leaders asked for more troops and those troops were not supplied.

Read the book ''Cobra II'' by General Bernard Trainor. He is another general whose name is not listed on this list but whose advice is very crucial and whose history of the Iraq war is a very timely reminder of what really happened, not only in the early months of the war but later on. It is a truly shocking book that all Americans should read so we never repeat these mistakes again. So that we go into future conflicts better aware of the dangers and better prepared, and so the American people are fully informed in advance so they are not shocked by things, for example, that General Colin Powell knew all along.

Mr. Speaker, it is going to be an interesting debate tomorrow. Ten hours on a largely innocuous resolution. This will probably be used as part of the public relations initiative that we are seeing now. I found the President's trip to Iraq very interesting. I think he stayed a full 5 hours. I hope he learned a lot, because it takes 15 hours to fly over there and 15 hours to fly back, and to stay only 5 hours is not a great learning opportunity.

I hope, too, we will have fuller bipartisan communication. When the President first announced that he was going to speak to the new Iraqi Cabinet by teleconference from Camp David, I thought, that's good. Maybe he can speak to House and Senate leadership the same way, maybe even in person, because there are so few opportunities for that interaction, even though we work at different ends of the same street, Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. Speaker, we will get through this conflict. We will bring our troops home safely. Nobody knows exactly when yet, but we must stabilize that tough region of the world. We must bring hope to so many people who have been oppressed, especially Muslim women and religious minorities and people who yearn for freedom. We can and will overcome.

We welcome the good news that we have received recently. We want more good news. I think it will come, but there will be bad patches as well.

As we face the debate tomorrow, I think it is important for all Americans to read the text first before they have a strong reaction to it one way or the other, so they can read and see whether the whereas and resolved clauses are offensive, or whether they find them as I do, largely praise for two central objectives that I think all Americans can agree with: praise for our troops and praise for the valor of the Iraqi people.

We will prevail in this conflict, Mr. Speaker. It is not easy to mark out today a path to victory, but I trust our men and women in uniform. I trust our troops on the ground and our military experts, not our civilian experts, to get us through this because we have the finest fighting force in the history of the world and that will keep America strong.

IRAQ AND IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the privilege and the honor to address you and address the House of Representatives and the American people who are viewing these proceedings that take place in these Chambers continually as we deliberate and debate.

I came here to take up another subject matter, but as I listened to the gentleman from Tennessee, he raised a number of points that I am compelled to respond to. I will just say I am glad I have a more optimistic viewpoint about the history of this country, about the current events, about the most recent current events and especially about the last 3½ years within Iraq. Further and longer ago than that, our operations within Afghanistan, about how this Nation has conducted its foreign policy, about how the Commander in Chief has made his decisions on foreign policy, and the direction for the future.

I would just back up to this. I would say that the gentleman from Tennessee, when he states that we are the greatest Nation, I do agree with him. We are the greatest Nation. We are the unchallenged greatest Nation in the history of the world. Often folks on the other side of the aisle disagree with that statement, so I am very refreshed to hear someone on that side of the aisle say we are a great Nation. In fact, I look forward to us becoming an even greater Nation going into the future, and we can't do that if we are going to wallow in guilt and self-pity and pessimism. We have a positive track record. Did we think we could go to war and not face adversity?

Some of the criticism is that Vice President CHENEY and Secretary Rumsfeld and others said we would be greeted as liberators, according to the gentleman. He contends we were not.

I was one of the first Members of Congress to arrive in Iraq after Iraq was liberated, and I recall and I have videotape of traveling down through a Sunni section of Baghdad, where we would be the most hated, according to national news media and the minority party; people that you would think would be throwing grenades and shooting at you, and perhaps throwing stones and making all kinds of vile gestures at American conquerors. In fact, we were liberators. As we rode down through on that convoy on those narrow streets in Baghdad several months after the liberation of Iraq, I looked out the window at military-age Iraqi men, and they looked into the window of my vehicle at me. I couldn't discern what they were thinking. They didn't know who I was. They just knew it was not your normal transportation going through there.

So I did like we do in Iowa. We meet them on the road. We are uncomfortable with silence and without acknowledging someone we see, so I began to wave to these military-age Iraqi men, men between the ages of 16 years up to 45, standing along the sides of the street in groups of two to three, groups up to 18, and they may be 10 to 15 feet away from my vehicle. The instant I did that, they waved back at me. They waved back and smiled with a gleeful smile and gave me thumbs up.

Here is an American in Iraq, a Representative, and just by the fact of the identification of being an American was all they needed, not necessarily a Representative of Congress, there to be part of that city, to see that country that now was for the first time liberated in the history of the world.

No, we were greeted as liberators. We were greeted as liberators in a country that had not been liberated in their history. Of course, there have been difficulties since that period of time. It is odd to me that the gentleman from Tennessee takes issue with the decisions and strategy that were made. In closing, he said he trusts our military experts, not our civilian experts. The experts who put together the strategy to liberate Iraq were essentially the same people that put together the military planning and operational strategy to liberate Afghanistan.

And the criticism of the Iraq operation is essentially the same criticism that we heard of the Afghanistan operation. The difference is that in Afghanistan it was over so quickly and over so successfully, and people there went to the polls and voted and elected themselves new leaders and directed their national destiny and live in freedom for the first time on that spot of the globe for the first time ever in their history. That all took place in Afghanistan, even though the debate over here on this side of the aisle, the debate on the part of the liberal pundits, was it's another Vietnam. You will never succeed in Afghanistan. No Nation has ever been able to go in and invade and occupy Afghanistan and get out of there with their military intact. That is a hostile area that can never be occupied and conquered, and history has proven that. That is the statement with Afghanistan over and over and over again. Afghanistan, another Vietnam.

But, you know, military success, political success and economic success has a tendency to muzzle the critics. And the critics have been flat muzzled on Afghanistan. And yet they draw the same criticism towards Iraq. Afghanistan, 25 million people, liberated. Hostile terrain, couldn't be invaded. We didn't invade them, we liberated them. We worked with the Northern Alliance and we worked with the people in Afghanistan and gave them an opportunity at freedom.

Their struggles are going on yet today. In fact, there has been a reignition of some of the opposition there. But we are not hearing criticism. We are not hearing the other side of the aisle say we never should have gone there because we knew that al Qaeda was operating in Afghanistan. We knew we needed to go in and knock out the Taliban. We knew that was a base of operations for terrorists who were sending people to come to this country to kill us because they believe that their path to salvation is killing people not like them, and we are one of their preferred targets.

So all of this criticism of Afghanistan, 25 million people, mountains and difficult terrain and difficult transportation routes, has been muted by the resounding success in Afghanistan. And the same people gave the same advice on a country with the same population and different terrain, easier terrain but a different location, and different people, different countries surrounding Iraq, and we ended up with being greeted as liberators. And in the aftermath of the greetings as liberators, there was an insurgency that rose up; an insurgency that was founded and supported by a lot of cash dollars, billions in cash dollars that were spirited out of Iraq, American dollars out of the banks of Iraq by Saddam Hussein, his regime, into other countries where that money was used again to pay for terrorists to come back into Iraq and blow themselves up. To detonate and build, and make and set and detonate improvised explosive devices.

Seldom do we see them come out of the shadows and attack our military troops straight up front. But the insurgency, what I call a terrorist-organized operation, as it grew in Iraq, then so did the criticism grow. While this is going on, the lust for power for the White House, the people on the other side of the aisle are willing to put our military men and women at risk so they can achieve their political gain, which would be to win back the White House and seek to take over the majority in the House of Representatives and

convince the American people that they know what's best.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not hearing a positive agenda. I am hearing this agenda that says pull out. Pull out to the horizon. Sit and wait until there is a problem and then move in. Somehow this same message that keeps coming from the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee would be one, conflicting with the same message that comes out of sometimes the same mouths that, well, we will pull out to the horizon in a country we should have more troops in, or maybe should have had more troops in, and never mind that we are up now to 267,000 Iraqis in uniform defending Iraqis that are trained, uniformed, equipped, and in these operations and initiating operations as we speak today in that country over there and performing very well.

For the first time Iraq does have a sovereign government that represents a sovereign people and a Nation where they can begin now to build their future. They have a Prime Minister who has named a full Cabinet. And this Cabinet can now resolve many of the sectarian differences that are there within Iraq itself and move them forward since now they have a Secretary of Defense and a Secretary of the Interior, a strong Prime Minister with some vision that has taken a role to lead. It takes time to put these pieces in place, and we have to let the Iraqi people make these decisions and do that, and it is taking place.

So this criticism, why is it brought up now? Why do I hear the question, why did the National Guard have to scrounge around for metal to weld or bolt onto their equipment to protect them from IEDs?

□ 2145

This issue raised by the gentleman from Tennessee, Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld said, appropriately and accurately, you go to war with the Army that you have. And it implies you go to war with the equipment that you have, and then when the unforeseen happens, and it was unforeseen that Humvees would be used as military vehicles in that kind of a combat environment. No war in the past had seen improvised explosive devices. No war in the past had seen suicide bombers that would run into a crowd of soldiers and blow themselves up or a crowd of women or children, school children. No war had seen terrorists or the likes of Zarqawi. But yet, even though no one had ever seen these circumstances before, somehow the people on the other side of the aisle believe the President, the Secretary of Defense and these civilian leaders that are labeled to be so wrong, should have been able to anticipate something that had never happened before, that there is no pattern for and no indication for, and they want to claim that they were right, but I don't think any one of them are on record predicting we ought to watch out for improvised explosive devices and I don't think any one of them were on the record saying we are going to have suicide bombers in Iraq. And I don't think any one of them are on record saying that these suicide bombers were going to come from any place other than Iraq, coming in from all over the Arab world, places like Jordan or Egypt or Saudi Arabia or Afghanistan or Pakistan. All those countries have supplied suicide bombers to come into Iraq that detonated themselves because they have been trained in those countries to give up their lives in the idea that somehow their path to salvation is in seeking to kill those who are not like them, and that means us.

The civilian leadership that led us into Iraq is the same civilian leadership that led us into Afghanistan. The military leadership that led us into Afghanistan is the same military leadership that led us into Iraq. If we are going to be critical of the judgment, the decisions and the tactics that were used in Iraq, and the people that made the decisions, then let's hear it from the other side. Let's hear their criticism for the same people, for the same decisions, for similar tactics that were utilized in Afghanistan. And the reason we don't hear that is because of the distinction between the easy results as opposed to a distinction between a philosophical or a judgment disagreement.

This is Monday morning quarterbacking, Mr. Speaker, and nothing else, and it is done for political opportunism and no other reason. And while we hear that, however much is said about supporting our military, that language, that talk, Mr. Speaker, undermines our military, weakens their ability to be effective, and they have got to try all the harder. They have got to bolster their spirit all the harder, and they do. And I go over there and I meet them and visit them, and their spirit is strong and their morale is strong. And they did pick up metal and bolt and weld it onto their machines because that is what Americans do. We make do with what we have and we go scrounge and find what we need and we get things in the pipeline as fast as we can to get things up-armored and we did. And today, and for a long time in Iraq there hasn't been any equipment leave the wire that is not fully armored. And it has been a long, long time since anybody left the wire without a bulletproof vest and the right kind of equipment to protect them from the flying bullets and shrapnel that takes place over there. And our medics and our medical corps, all of the people that are taking care of our wounded are doing a better job, far better job than ever in the history of the world and warfare. They have transferred, the last time I checked this number, and it is a little bit dated now, Mr. Speaker, but the last number that I had as I stood as we loaded a C–17 with wounded out of Landstuhl Hospital there in Germany to come over here to land at Andrews Air Force Base, and some of those wounded soldiers would go to Walter Reed, some would go to Bethesda. But as I stood there and lent a small hand in helping load some of those wounded as that plane was loaded, one of the officers there told me that they had transferred 36,000 sick and wounded, those that needed medical care out of that theater in Iraq from Iraq to Ramstein Air Force Base and from Ramstein over to Landstuhl hospital, from there back to the United States. And in those transfers, 36,000 transfers, and some of those people would have been transferred, I think, counted twice, however that worked out, they lost one, one soldier en route. And that one that they lost was due to cardiac arrest that was they believe unrelated to the injuries. It is an astonishing accomplishment. It is something that I can't imagine how one could even dream to have that kind of success. And they are, they are dedicated.

The statement that our Republican leadership must feel insecure or wouldn't bring up this bill and not allow amendments, why would any leadership that was insecure bring up this bill, this resolution that supports and defends our efforts in Iraq? Why would they bring it up at all if they felt insecure, Mr. Speaker? I will tell you that we are very secure in this, very confident in this. The difference is we are not getting this message out to the people. This debate is so the American people can hear the truth about what is going on in this global war on terror, and in particular, the battlefield of Iraq. That is the mission that we are on here tomorrow, to uncover and speak truthfully and illuminate the good things that are happening, the progress that is being made. And I intend to engage in that debate and help with that cause and lend a hand, because every voice that stands on the side of our military is a voice that accelerates the end of the war and every voice that undermines or degrades or is detrimental towards the effort and erodes the credibility of our Commander in Chief, our Secretary of Defense, our General, our Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Peter Pace, all of our officers, any voice that weakens their credibility delays a successful end to this war. And delaying a successful end to this war doesn't just put our troops at risk, Mr. Speaker. It costs their lives. So I am proud of the work that is being done. I am proud of the character of the people that are serving there. I stand with them every step of the way. I have never met a more honorable people. And I believe in the history of America, in the history of the world, there has never been a better military go off to war than this current crop that we have. Our Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines, our Reserve personnel, and our National Guard personnel. And I don't say that to disparage the efforts of any previous war or any previous engagements or

any previous peace time service. But I will just, I say it to build on the honorable record that was built in all of those previous conflicts. And I say this because we have, first of all, an all volunteer military. There is no one over there in that theater that was drafted to go to this war. They all volunteered. And, in fact, everyone that is over there now has re-upped in this same climate of this war. So it wasn't that they happened to be a National Guard soldier that thought they would just train 1 weekend a month and get their 6-week active duty in and pretty much take life easy and cash the check. Those people had a chance to drop out. But they are re-upping in greater numbers than we ever anticipated. That is not a demoralized military. That is a high morale military that is reupping on these tasks, because they believe in this mission, as I believe in their mission. And we have an all volunteer military, and they are getting the best training there is in the world, build upon the culture of efficiency and proud combat, and we add to that the equipment that they have, the modern technology that they have, which eclipses that of anybody anywhere in the world today, let alone in the previous half a decade or more. They have the best equipment, the best training, the best personnel, they are all volunteers. And our active duty personnel are supplemented by our reserve troops and our National Guard troops. And those people bring with them the skills of their professional lives to supplement the skills of the training of their military lives, and that is a great combination for a highly technical military that we have today, and that is how we could have the technical ability to put a laser on a safe house.

Now there is an oxymoron. I bet you that is what Zarqawi is saying in the next life. It is really an oxymoron. There I thought I was in a safe house. Well, it wasn't such a safe house for those people. But to lay a cross-hairs of a laser beam on a, quote, safe house, Mr. Speaker, and seconds later have that safe house just simply detonated by a 500-pound bomb, and then to be sure, just drop a second 500-pound bomb in there.

It puts me in mind of something that Rush Limbaugh said before Desert Storm back in 1991. He said, Mr. Saddam Hussein, I have got some good news and some bad news for you. Now, here's the bad news. Or actually, no, I tell you, here's the good news. He said we have a weapon, at the time he was talking about cruise missiles rather than J–DAMs. We have a weapon, and the bad news is, let's see. I am going to get this right. The good news is for us, we can take this weapon and we can fire it from wherever we choose into the country we choose, and we can fire it into the city within the country, and we can put it in the block within the city, and we can put it within the building within the block, and we can put it through the window of the building within the block within the city within the country that we choose and you know, the good news for you is we just shot off a half a dozen of those missiles and every one of them missed its target. The bad news is the most any of them missed by was an inch and a half, Mr. Saddam Hussein. And that was the way Desert Storm was. And we are more accurate today with the weapons that we have. And it saves lives. And it brings the close of this war closer, and it convinces the enemy that they can not win, and in fact, that they have lost and it is a matter of time, until they resolve to accept the reality.

That is the object of war, after all, Mr. Speaker. And von Klauswitz wrote a book on war. And in that he said, the object of war is to destroy the enemy's will and ability to conduct war. Destroy their will and their ability. You could be sitting there with ranks of tanks and all kinds of missiles and Air Force and Navy, and AK–47s, you can have all of this equipment. You can have an Army with 2 million people, all trained and ready. But if you don't have the will to conduct the war, all of the ability doesn't count because you can't unleash, you can't mobilize that effort. So Klauswitz saw, if you destroyed some of the ability, destroy some tanks, destroy some missiles, destroy some Air Force, take away the ability to provide fuel and food, that would destroy some of the ability, but also would deplete the will. If you could destroy the will to conduct the war, you have destroyed the ability to conduct the war. That was the philosophy of Klauswitz. And for years, since 1832, that has been the definition of war. Object of war, destroy the enemy's will and ability to conduct war.

STEVE KING's definition comes like this. A war is never over till the losing side realizes they have lost. You have to convince them that they have lost. That is all you have to do. And if you can simply send them a letter or go down here on the floor and give a speech, put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and they would read that and say oh, boy, I guess we can't win against these people. I am going to surrender. Maybe Ahmadinejad would just come to that conclusion, because you know we are not going to give up on that. We are not going to let that man have his nuclear ability. But if we could just simply send a letter and convince them that they will lose the war, then they wouldn't engage in the war, but seldom will they give up quite so easy. And so that means that we have to turn up the pressure, turn up the diplomatic pressure and then maybe do some economic sanctions and then maybe do a blockade and then if things get bad enough, maybe we have to run a little operation in there. But at some point, this deterrent effect that says you are going to have to take us seriously, we will not blink, we are resolved to impose this war, this position of peace on this country, at some point the losing side, in despair, sometimes, but without having hope of coming out of it with any other solution, throws up their hands or as we say in a chess game, tips over their king and says I have lost. I surrender. I am willing to accept the consequences. I gave it my best, but the price is too great. I no longer have the will to conduct war.

That is what we are seeking to do in Iraq. That is what we are seeking to do globally in this global war on terror. And we are a good long ways down that path, and we would be much further down that path and perhaps the battlefield of Iraq would be concluded if the naysayers and the detractors from that side of the aisle hadn't first sent their emissaries over there to surrender before we ever went into Iraq. And we have relentlessly been trying to convince the enemy that we will lose and they will win since that period of time. We will hear some of this debate tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, and I look forward to that and we will knock those arguments down in this chamber. And the American people will understand who supports the military, who doesn't, who supports the Commander in Chief, and who doesn't.

And I would lay another principle out here that is not a negotiable principle, to say you are for the troops and against their mission.

□ 2200

You cannot separate those two. If you are for the troops, you have to ask them will you put your life on the line for the freedom of the people in this country, this great country? And the gentleman from Tennessee and I agree on that. This great country, the United States of America. But you cannot ask someone to put their life on the line for your freedom and tell them ''but you are on the wrong mission.'' You have got to support the mission. You have got to support the troops. And if you separate those two, if you say I am against your mission, it is the wrong mission, you never should have gone, you should not be there, you ought to get out and come home, but if something happens to you, you lost your life and it has been a worthless cause, that is what they are saying over on this side of the aisle. One and the same. You support the mission; you support the troops. You cannot support the troops and not the mission. These things are bound together, and they are bound together because we asked them to risk their lives on a mission that we believe in and we have endorsed that mission.

And so the other morning not that long ago, al-Zarqawi went to meet his maker because of some really good targeting, some good intelligence, some cooperation from some other entities over there, some good work with the coalition forces, good work with the special task force that had been shadowing him and following him for a long time and gathering in all the intelligence and the intelligence tips from

400 a month a year ago to 4,000 a month today. They picked up enough information to track al-Zarqawi and put those bombs right down in on that thing that he thought was a safe house, that we call a safe house, that was not so safe for al-Zarqawi. But you know, blowing up that house made this world a lot safer for the rest of us; so I will call it a safe house by that standard.

And I am pleased and extraordinarily grateful that our military are there doing the job they do with the professionalism that they have, Mr. Speaker. And I am looking forward to this debate tomorrow. It will not go long enough and it will not make enough points to satisfy me. I think we need to do this over an extended period of time. And I will be here to join in that debate.

But I digress. I came to this floor to speak about a different subject matter, Mr. Speaker. And as I listened to the gentleman from Tennessee, I believe that I needed to provide an alternate viewpoint from some of those opinions that came out here. And I do respect the gentleman from Tennessee, and he is one of the more intellectual people that we have in this House Chamber, and his intentions are good and I believe he is a strong patriot. I am just hoping to redirect some of his perspectives and perhaps that of some of the folks that live in that region down there in Tennessee.

But I came here, Mr. Speaker, to talk about another issue, and it is an issue that stands out everywhere most of any of us go in the entire United States of America these days. It is an issue that for perhaps a year has been front and center in all of the discussions that take place in the Fifth District of Iowa that I represent, this western third of Iowa. And certainly wherever else I go around the country, it is a subject that comes up. I see things happen in my office. There might be a group that comes over and they have met and their organization has produced one or two or three or five or maybe six or ten points that they want to discuss with me and their positions of their organization. We all do this on a regular basis. And as I sit down with them, I can see them going through those points kind of quickly, and as they get through those points, they want to reserve some time. And whether it is an issue that seems to be relevant to their organization or whether it is not, they will get down to where there is maybe 15 minutes left in our 30-minute meeting and then they will say, Now some of us want to talk to you about immigration, Congressman, and we have these issues we want to discuss with you and we are concerned a little bit about that. So they begin bringing up the issue. And I engage in those conversations, of course, and sometimes I find a little bit different viewpoint, a little bit different way to solve these problems. But the core of this, middle American knows this and the southern border knows this and even some folks out there on the left coast understand this and some folks over on the right coast also understand this because the American people are great respecters of the rule of law, and we understand that if we did not have the rule of law here in the United States of America, we would not be this great Nation that Mr. COOPER and I agree that we are.

And now I am going on my own judgment here and not representing the gentleman from Tennessee except that we agree it is a great Nation. This Nation was founded upon the philosophy of the Declaration that sits in the back of this book and the Constitution that was written upon the philosophy of the Declaration. And these freedoms that we have and these responsibilities that we have are founded upon these three branches of government, not three coequal branches of government, not separate but equal branches of government, codependent branches of government, not equal. The founders established this country with a constitutional principle, Mr. Speaker, that gives the buck stops here to the legislature because we are the voice of the people.

And so each branch has its own power base. And the executive branch is to carry out and enforce the laws. The legislative branch is to introduce and pass the laws, and here we start all the appropriations and the tax bills and they go over to the Senate where they get processed over there and bounced back here, and then often to the President. But it is our job to initiate the funding, initiate the tax bills, and to establish an immigration policy by a constitutional directive here in this Constitution, Mr. Speaker.

And so the American people respect this rule of law that is built upon this foundation of the rule of law called the Constitution. And when they read that Constitution, they know that the rule of law covers immigration. And they know that we are obligated to establish immigration laws should the will of the people be such. And we have passed that legislation many times throughout the history of this great Nation. But even though we have, I believe, adequate laws to enforce our immigration laws, the American people understand that they have not been enforced. They have not been enforced with anywhere near the vigor required to slow down and stop the flood of humanity that is pouring across our southern border.

As I speak here tonight, I just do a little bit of round number math, and we are in that area of 11,000 illegals a day pouring across our southern border; perhaps 12,000. So that comes down into the area of while I speak here, there will be perhaps 500 people who have illegally crossed the border, just our southern border from Mexico into the United States, while I stand here for this 60-minute period of time, perhaps 500 people. And it does come up, if I remember right, to about one person every 8 seconds coming into the United States.

I have gone down to the border a number of times to get a better feel for what is going on down there. I have been there on what they call the red carpet tour with the Border Patrol. I met with the ICE people. I have flown in the helicopters over that border at night with the giant lamp that they have on some of those choppers, and I have done it also with infrared, infrared optical equipment. I have been to the stations. I have talked to the Border Patrol officers. I have gone back down on my own and slipped in on a surprise trip and arrived at the ports of entry and gone in and talked to our Border Patrol people to get a feel of what it is really like on the ground.

And I have gone down to one of the most dangerous and active crossings on that entire border and sat there at night in the dark for hours, in utter silence, and listened as the cars came up across the desert from Mexico, stopped by a big mesquite tree. They opened the doors, let their people out. You can hear their backpacks hit the ground, pick them back up again. You could hear them infiltrate back through the brush to climb through the fence and come into the United States of America on a night where there was just about a three-quarter moon, not enough to actually be able to tell you exactly what I saw, but I know exactly what I heard. As I would hear those vehicles come down there, there is only one they would come there, and they came on a regular basis about every 20 minutes, shuttling people down, dropping them off, shuttle people down and dropping them off, and there they would come back across the border into the United States.

Some of these people just want to come into the United States, they say, for a better life. And as I listened to that, I imagine that is true with some of them. And it is a fact that there are a fair number that are here that are working, that are raising their families, and are good citizens so far as we can see. And they are our neighbors, and they have actually built a pretty good appreciation and affinity within these communities. They have made themselves useful, and when that happens, they make themselves good neighbors.

But the fact remains that those who came into the United States illegally are criminals. I see the signs in the streets that say ''I am not a criminal.'' Yes. If you violated the Criminal Code of the United States of America, you are a criminal. And if you came into the United States illegally, you are a criminal.

And the penalty for illegal entry into the United States is 6 months in a Federal penitentiary and then forceable deportation. That is what is written into the law. I cannot think of a time when that law has been utilized and the penalty has been imposed. And the time that I have served on the Immigration Subcommittee here in the House Judiciary Committee, not one

that I know of. It may be the case that it actually has been utilized, but I cannot think of a single time.

So people come in and violate our immigration laws. If they get caught, sometimes they get a bus ride down to the border. Sometimes they promise to appear. Sometimes they promise not to come back into the United States, and we know that people who break our Criminal Code probably are not going to keep their promise if it does not suit them to do so.

So we have this border that is 2,000 miles long, 2,000 miles long, with 11,000 people a day pouring across that border, 500 an hour, one every 8 seconds. And where they will go is they will follow the path of least resistance. It is like electricity, just a natural equation.

If you go to San Diego and build a wall there, which we have done and it is not quite finished but we are working on it, if you build that, they will go around the end. If you put some more pressure on there and put Border Patrol there, they go into Arizona and cross the border in the middle of the desert. And they will walk 20 to 25 miles from Mexico to get to the border sometimes. Sometimes they are dropped off very near the border. Sometimes they walk quite a ways. Sometimes they will walk 20, 25 miles up into the United States to get to a highway where there is a predetermined pickup place and they will jump in the back of a truck or in a van or in a vehicle, and as soon as they are on that highway and gone, that is the case. They are gone.

And with the illegal drugs that come into the United States, the difficulty that comes with shutting that off, a lot of pressure says to push those drugs into the United States. So if we are successful in shutting those drugs down at our points of entry, and I am not convinced that we are, but if the odds are a little better to drive a truck across the desert and drive across the border into the United States, they do a lot of that. Stray trucks, sometimes a semi right down the highway even, with a whole load of marijuana in it.

In fact, I was down there not too long ago, within about the last month, and as I was near the border, they picked up a white pickup and it was driven by an individual that was covered with tattoos from his waist to his neck, and he had a ''13'' tattooed on the inside of his forearm right here, and that ''13'' indicates MS–13, Mr. Speaker. And that is the most vile and violent gang this hemisphere has ever seen. And below in a false bed of that pickup truck, when we took the jaws of life and opened it up, there was about a 7-inch thick false floor in there with a false chamber. And in that chamber it was packed full of bags of marijuana, each one weighing a little over ten pounds. So approximately 180 pounds or more of marijuana under the bed of that pickup. And this MS–13 individual, he had gotten into the United States. We were 20 miles inside the United States, but he looked suspicious, drove erratically. And they converged on him, brought the helicopter, chased him around with a Black Hawk, brought the ground people in, and finally corner him and collared him.

Now, why would someone who had 180 pounds of marijuana drive erratically and tip off the officers to go chase him down? Mr. Speaker, I would submit that 180 pounds of marijuana was a decoy, that it was a decoy that was designed to pull the helicopter in, to bring all of the Border Patrol officers in and the enforcement officers in so that when they converged upon that vehicle with that 180 pounds of marijuana, the vehicle with 2,000 pounds of marijuana could shoot on through the gap. It happens all the time. The officers tell me that on a regular basis. Sometimes they are able to catch the decoy and the other load. That is how they know. Sometimes that load goes through and they are unable to catch them.

So those are the circumstances down there. And this border that sometimes is not marked at all, and in much of New Mexico it has a concrete pylon from ridge to ridge, as you can see through an old style transit, put the crosshairs on there. That is how the border is marked.

□ 2215

A vehicle can drive across that border anywhere. How do you control a border like that when you have $65 billion worth of illegal drugs coming across that border? That's billion with a B. $65 billion, a powerful force.

I want to someday look that up and see just how that ranks in the gross domestic product of nations. Just the illegal drugs coming out of Mexico into the United States. Ninety percent of the illegal drugs in America come through the Mexican border. That is $65 billion worth. If you couple that with the $20 billion worth of wages that are earned here, much of it by illegals and wired back down to Mexico, those two things add up to $85 billion.

How much is $85 billion, Mr. Speaker? I don't know. It is beyond my comprehension. But I can tell you, by comparison, the oil revenue from Mexico is $28 billion. Yet they have $65 billion worth of illegal drugs, another $20 billion worth of wages that come out of the gross domestic product of the United States. That is a powerful force.

And so if we shut down some of these illegal drugs that are coming across our ports of entry, shut down some of the illegal people traffic across our ports of entry, then they simply go around, they go out in the desert, they cut through somewhere, and then we do this other thing, this other wise tactic, I will say, and put that in quotes, we build a vehicle barrier along on the border. That consists of some 5-inch square tubing, drill a hole, set it in it, pour concrete in it and take this square steel tubing and set it up and then weld another piece of 5-inch square tubing, oh, about headlight high on a vehicle that runs along there. That is a vehicle barrier. It is not a fence. It keeps out cars and trucks. It is designed to let antelope and snakes and any other animals go back and forth because surely we couldn't upset Mother Nature by defending ourselves from all the illegal drug traffic that is going on. It is designed to let wildlife go through. Of course, if you can't drive a semi through there or a straight truck or a pickup any longer, then you just simply get your human mules there because they can climb through there as easily as an antelope can climb through that vehicle barrier.

So they climb through with their 50-pound pack of marijuana and a human pack train of seven or eight or 10 or 20 or 25 or even, I heard one report, as high as 100 young men each with 50 pounds of marijuana on their back, trekking across the desert, crossing the vehicle barrier by throwing their pack through, go through, put their pack back on and walk across the desert, 25 miles to a highway, where there is a predetermined pickup location, throw their marijuana in the back of a truck, their bags of marijuana, some get in the truck and go on, now they are in the United States to stay if they choose. Some turn around and walk back to Mexico to get another load. This is going on night after night after night, bringing these illegal drugs into the United States of America.

$65 billion worth, 11,000 people a day, 77,000 people a week, 4 million people a year. And we are spending $8 billion a year to protect our southern border. That is $4 million a mile. $4 million a mile, and we can't stop $65 billion worth of illegal drugs? And why not?

And so as I go down there and sit on that border and listen and I talk to the Border Patrol officers and ICE and the other officers down there, I am always asking them that question, how do we get to this point where we're successful? First of all, how do you define success? And how do we set things up so that we can shut off illegal human traffic and shut off the illegal drug traffic? In fact, I believe the illegal drug traffic is more dangerous than the illegal human traffic but they come together in a package, illegals carrying illegal drugs. They come in a package.

And it is sometimes terrorists coming into the United States, people that are from nations of interest. Isn't that a nice politically correct phrase for a terrorist nation, a nation of interest? And we have caught people down on the southern border who come from terrorist nations, nations of interest, whose identification was in the high risk database for the Department of Homeland Security. When that happens, that is the last we hear of that. I don't know how many there are. I know it happens. I know it has happened fairly recently. I know that if we caught some, more got away. Those

that came here to do us ill are going to pay more money to get brought into the United States through the illegal traffic route across our southern border because they have the resources to do that. When they have the resources to do it, and instead of paying a thousand or $1,500, now I hear that the coyote prices have maybe gone up as high as $2,000. Instead of paying a couple of thousand bucks to come in, it is a $30,000 ticket on some of them, which means it is essentially a guarantee that you are going to be here. Once they are here, these are not the people that are carrying in 50 pounds of marijuana. They are the people that are in here to be part of an enclave, to be part of a cell that one day will rise up against us here in this country the way they rose up in France and in Spain and in Great Britain and also just most recently in Canada. It will eventually happen here as we are infiltrated by people who believe again that their path to salvation is in killing us.

And so, Mr. Speaker, the solution to this is not a simple one. It is not a single component solution. But I have an addition to this component that is a very constructive one and an essential component to the solution. That, Mr. Speaker, is the necessity for us to not just build a vehicle barrier, not just build a simple fence, but to build a wall, to build a wall that can actually be utterly effective in keeping illegals out of the United States of America. If we can do that, we can shut down 90 percent of the illegal drugs that come into this country at the same time. We can force all of the traffic to go through our ports of entry. And if it is all coming through the ports of entry, then we can turn many more of our resources on our ports of entry, where now we have thousands of Border Patrol agents that are out there trying to chase people down in the desert that are scattered all over the place, they can patrol this wall that I propose we build, but they can focus a lot more resources on the ports of entry.

I simply put it this way. This cardboard box I have represents the desert floor. The desert floor in a lot of these areas where it will be suitable working conditions. Sometimes we are going to run into rocks, sometimes into mountains. When you hit the rock, you don't have to dig any deeper. They're not going under there. So we will just pour the concrete on the rock and put some pins in there to tie it together and we will be fine.

This represents the desert floor and a trench that I would dig through there to build this concrete wall. This looks at it from the end, a cross-sectional view, I would say. Sock a trencher in and trench this. At the same time we do it, we would pour a footing in here with a slot in it. And I would demonstrate, Mr. Speaker. This would be the footing that I would put in there. This would be a slip form footing, which means that the style that you see here with a slot in it that would receive precast concrete panels, the bottom of this would be 5 feet deep. So it would be a trencher that you would sock in here. You would have some augers here on the side. You would pull that together. As you pull this down, you pump concrete in right behind it.

I would put it this way. I would sock in here, dig this trench, and as this trench moved on, I would be pouring concrete in that trench. Maybe the way to go would be from about this end. Let's just say that we are pouring concrete here and trenching this way. As the trencher comes along, the concrete pours right behind the trencher, and you move along at the pace that you can deliver the concrete to it and dig the trench. This concrete will set up, and you would leave this slot in the middle. The reason for this slot, then, in the middle is so that it can receive the precast panels.

So now I have this concrete footing. Actually the earth would be right to the top of this concrete here on each side. It sets in the ground 5 feet. It has got the stability that is there. It has got the strength. It has got a place to receive these panels.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I would have trucks pulling in within about 2 days of cure time. We would start setting in precast concrete panels. They would be a finished height to 12 feet and about 10 feet wide. They would weigh about, oh, 9,800 pounds or so, 6 inches thick. They would beef them up a little on the bottom, taper them a little on the top. You would just take a crane and drop these in.

I would tell you that our little old construction company would not be bidding this, I don't know if you would call it a conflict of interest or not, we wouldn't be down there bidding in Arizona but it has the kind of work we could do, Mr. Speaker. I would add that we could put together about a mile of this a day, just dropping this in with a crane, swing them in place. Actually they would go together a little better than that. Take these off the bed of the truck, swing them in, drop them in just like that, they drop in the slot, the slot holds them up. It's firm. It's fixed. And it's that easy to put together a 12-foot tall concrete wall, 6 inches thick, precast panels, reinforced, of course, tied together with tongue and groove in this kind of a fashion. And when we are done with this, this is a wall that they are not going to climb through and they are not going to cut through. They may try to climb over and they may try to dig under. It has not going to be that easy to dig under because we are deep, remember, 5 feet deep. Maybe we should go a little bit deeper. I wouldn't disagree with that.

So they don't go over the top, Mr. Speaker. I happen to have this handy dandy little piece of concertina wire that I would put right on top here and install this wire like this. We could have a little bit more concentrated concertina wire so we could put two rolls on here. On top of this concrete we could also put on any kind of optical equipment, vibration sensers, any other kind of surveillance equipment that we so choose. This wall would not go exactly on the border in my mind but it would be back north of the border perhaps 60 to 100 feet so that there is a patrol zone between. I would have a fence right on the border and that would be the fence that thou shalt not cross. In fact, I would hang a sign on the south side in Spanish that says, check this web page, you can go to the U.S. consul and apply to come to the United States legally and that is what you ought to do. I would put that every mile. I would have a nice sign there that would say, You're welcome to apply. We welcome all people to come apply and come to the United States legally, but don't cross this path because you're violating our laws.

Fifty-eight percent of the people in Mexico believe they have a right to come to the United States. And so this wall would have a value to keep out illegals. It would slow dramatically down. I think it would take 90 percent of the human traffic down. I think it would take 90 percent of the drug traffic down. And it sends a message to the south side of the border that says, You don't have a right to come here. We're a sovereign nation and we take our applications at the U.S. consul.

But this would be an effective structure that would free up the Border Patrol. They would still have to patrol. They would drive back and forth. They would cut sign here. They would check for tracks. If they caught anybody out here in no man's land, they would be picked up immediately. And if they got across this wall, it would be rare and we would see the tracks and we would be able to chase them down and I think we could catch nearly every one of them that did that.

Maybe they would want to come with a ladder. Somebody said, well, if you show me a 90-foot wall, I'll show you a 90-foot ladder. It is hard to carry a ladder across one fence and get it to the next one, Mr. Speaker. If so, we have an opportunity to catch them in between. I don't think they are going to carry that many ladders across that many miles of desert. We will know what kind of tactics they are using, we can beef it up, but they are not going to breach this wall easily. They are not going to go underneath this thing in any short period of people. They are not going to go over it easily. They are going to look at it and try to find another way. Some of them will decide, now the transaction cost is too high. I believe I'm just going to stay here in Mexico and maybe go to work and help improve that country, because that country needs its productive people if they are going to have any economic future. You empty a nation out of its vitality and what do you expect is going to happen? I don't know why it is Vicente Fox is willing to see his best people come to the United States, because the solution to what is wrong in

that country is within the people that are leaving, especially the people that are leaving.

They aren't all good folks that are coming here. A lot of them are but they come here for about three reasons. One of them is to come here and go to work, one of them is they are running away from something and maybe they are running away from the law down there, maybe they are running away for some other reason and maybe they are coming up here to do us harm. That is about the only three reasons why people are coming here. I cannot fathom why Vicente Fox would promote the exodus of his own people. In fact, 10 percent of the population of Mexico is here in the United States. That is a number that I believe is probably on the low side. The population of Mexico before the exodus was 104 million. If 10 million of them are here, let's just say that number is inflated a little bit. Let me round this down to 90 million just for the sake of discussion. If there are 90 million people left in Mexico and we pass the Senate version of this immigration that they passed here some weeks ago, and that version according to Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation, the lowest number he has is that it brings in 59 million people over the next 20 years.

□ 2230

That is 59 million people, added to at least another 20 million people. So we are up to 79 million people coming into the United States. That is the lowest number.

The highest numbers were pretty astonishing, up there around 200 million, but I think that range falls between 59 million and probably 92 million.

Let us just say 92 million people in the next 20 years, and are 90 million people left in Mexico? Some will come from those other countries down there. But I will say this that everyone who wants to come under the Senate version, everyone who wants to come to the United States will come to the United States under that bill.

It will not be an immigration policy that is designed for the interests of the United States. It will be the immigration policy that is designed for the wants of people who want to come here. We have never had a policy like that in the past, Mr. Speaker. It is not the intent of our founders when they gave us the charge in this Congress to write immigration law.

We are charged by our constituents, by the people in the United States of America, to devise an immigration policy for the economic, social and cultural well-being of the United States of America and nothing else.

We cannot be a safety valve for all of the poverty in the world. For every 1 million people that we could bring in across our southern border, there are another 10 or 12 million people in the same region down there that are born. But for every person, the average citizen of Mexico, their average standard of living, there are still 4.6 billion people on the planet with a lower standard of living than the average citizen of Mexico.

So if it does our heart good to not say no to some of people who are our neighbors, what do we have to say to people that aren't our neighbors who live in much greater poverty. What do we say to the poverty in Bangladesh, and what do we say to the poverty in Africa?

The Senate bill leaves a lot of that open as well. The difference is it is easier to travel here from Mexico than it is from Bangladesh or Africa. So we would get more Mexicans than we would Bangladeshis. But that bill is wide open, and the future of this country, the destiny of this country, hangs in the balance.

As the American people do this debate, we need to come to an agreement. The message needs to get over to the Senate, and it needs to get to the White House, that we are going to stand on the rule of law, Mr. Speaker, and that we are going to have enforcement of our immigration laws in this country, and that we cannot have, we cannot have an immigration policy that is essentially a guest worker, temporary worker, amnesty plan, that is built upon the false promise of enforcement, when we have had 20 years to enforce our immigration laws and over the last 20 years, there has been less and less enforcement and more and more accusation of that.

Of the illegals coming into America, the numbers that were presumably 1 million in 1986 became 3 million by the time the amnesty was done. Now these numbers, we are talking with a straight face, 10- to 12 million people, and saying it is not amnesty.

But in reality, this 10- to 12 million is more like 20 million, 22 million, 27 million, somewhere in that category. The bill that has been passed in the Senate takes us up to 59 million or 70 million or 92 million. The cumulative total for all the immigration legally in the history of America, from the time we began to keep records until the last numbers we could total in, and those numbers would be 1820 to the year 2000, the cumulative total, Mr. Speaker, was 66.1 million people coming into the United States.

That is the immigration total for all of our history. Maybe it is off a couple or 3 million because I can't add those before 1820 and I can't add those after the year 2000. Statistics aren't available. There are 66 million people. The Senate version eclipses the grand cumulative total for the history of America all in one fell swoop. They say it is not amnesty, and it really isn't any big deal. We can do this because we need somebody to trim our lawns and trim our nails and wait on us in our mansions and change our bedding and cook our steaks.

How much of this work is not essential work? How much of this work is convenient because it is cheap? I can use a lot of servants, if they are cheap. So why can't I, you know, that is the attitude. We have this new ruling class in America. They made a lot of money hiring illegal labor, cheap labor.

And they have got this attitude that they ought to be able to hire this cheap labor also to wait on them in their mansions and trim their lawns and wait on them and drive their cars. They want to be able to hire them cheap and make a lot of money, and they want to hire them cheap so when they spend their money they can be well taken care of.

This is what is happening. The middle class is diminishing and shrinking. That strength of America has been a broad powerful middle class, not a shrinking middle class. We have never been an elitist country. We have never been an upper or lower class stratification. But the ruling class and the servant class are all that will be left if we let the open borders crowd rule in this immigration debate in America.

Mr. Speaker, I stand first on enforcement first and enforcement only. If I am able to see a demonstration of that enforcement being effective, and it has to be demonstrated for a number of years before I am going to believe there is a commitment. Then in that case I am willing at some point to have a discussion about what to do with the people that might be left here.

But in the meantime, I want to build this wall, and I want to put this wire on top, and I want to shut off illegal traffic at our border, and I want to shut off illegal drugs at our border. I want to end birthright citizenship, and I want to shut off the jobs magnet, and I want to hold the line on this until we can see that we have been effective.

When that day comes, maybe there is time for another debate. But until that time we have this bleeding patient, and we have got to stop the bleeding. We can worry about what the therapy program is if this patient recovers.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your indulgence.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ROTHMAN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 12:00 p.m. on account of a family obligation.

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. DEFAZIO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DOGGETT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KILPATRICK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DELAHUNT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KUCINICH, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COLE of Oklahoma) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, on June 21.

Mrs. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CARTER, for 5 minutes, on June 21.

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1445. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 520 Colorado Avenue in Arriba, Colorado, as the ''William H. Emery Post Office''.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 15, 2006, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

8040. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Azoxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0540; FRL-8063-2] received April 28, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8041. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Boscalid; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2003-0246; FRL-8064-4] received April 28, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8042. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Dimethenamid-p; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0216; FRL-7770-8] received April 28, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8043. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Flumioxazin; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2004-0398; FRL-8057-5] received April 28, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8044. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fomesafen; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0073; FRL-8062-6] received April 28, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8045. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Glufosinate Ammonium; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0301; FRL-8060-3] received April 28, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8046. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Potassium Silicate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0299; FRL-8069-6] received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8047. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Methoxyfenozide; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0404; FRL-8069-5] received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8048. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pendimethalin; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0056; FRL-8070-2] received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8049. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fenarimol; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0297; FRL-8061-4] received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8050. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans: Revisions to the Tennessee Nitrogen Oxides Budget and Allowance Trading Program [EPA-R04-OAR-2003-TN-0001, EPA-R04-OAR-2004-TN-0001-2004 13(a); FRL-8163-3] received April 28, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8051. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Delegation of Authority to Texas [EPA-R06-OAR-2005-TX-0034; FRL-8164-6] received April 28, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8052. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone; The 2006 Critical Use Exemption from the Phaseout of Methyl Bromide [FRL-8163-1] (RIN: 2060-AN18) received April 28, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8053. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Community Right-to-Know; Toxic Chemical Release Reporting Using North American Industry Classification System (NAICS); Final Rule [EPA-HQ-TRI-2002-0003; FRL-8180-2] (RIN: 2025-AA10) received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8054. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone; Recordkeeping and Reporting Requirements for the Import of Halon-1301 Aircraft Fire Extinguishing Vessels [EPA-HQ-OA-2005-0131; FRL-8181-2] received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8055. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revision of December 2000 Clean Air Act Section 112(n) Finding Regarding Electric Utility Steam Generating Units: and Standards of Performance for New and Existing Electric Utility Steam Generating Units: Reconsideration [EPA-HQ-OAR-2002-0056; FRL-8180-6] (RIN: 2060-AN50) received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8056. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri [EPA-R07-OAR-2006-046 2; FRL-8181-8] received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8057. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protetcion Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Missouri: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R07-RCRA-2006-0026; FRL-8163-4] received April 28, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8058. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting reports in accordance with Section 36(a) of the Arms Export Control Act, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

8059. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Model DH.125, HS.125, and BH.125 Series Airplanes; Model BAe.125 Series 800A (C-29A and U-125), 800B, 1000A, and 1000B Airplanes; and Model Hawker 800 (including variant U-125A), and 1000 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-20969; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-017-AD; Amendment 39-14443; AD 2006-01-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8060. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330-200 and -300 Series Airplanes, Model A340-200 and -300 Series Airplanes, and Model A340-541 and A340-642 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-23611; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-250-AD; Amendment 39-14453; AD 2006-02-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8061. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca S.A. Arrius Models 2B, 2B1, and 2F Turboshaft Engines [Docket No. 2000-NE-12-AD; Amendment 39-14423; AD 2001-08-14R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8062. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney JT8D Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98-ANE-48-AD; Amendment 39-14398; AD 2005-25-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8063. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca Artouse III Series Turboshaft Engines [Docket No. 99-NE-33-AD; Amendment 39-14434; AD 2005-26-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8064. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland (Formerly Rolls-Royce plc) Models Tay 650-15 and 651-54 Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2001-NE-02-AD; Amendment 39-14439; AD 2005-26-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8065. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF6-45A, CF6-50A, CF6-50C, and CF6-50E Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. FAA-2005-22124; Directorate Identifier 2005-NE-21-AD; Amendment 39-14427; AD 2005-26-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8066. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A320-111, -211, -212, -214, -231, -232, and -233 Airplanes [FAA-2005-23400; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-217-AD; Amendment 39-14429; AD 2005-19-16 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8067. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC-8-400 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22403; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-144-AD; Amendment 39-14426; AD 2005-26-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8068. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-1A11 (CL-60), CL-600-2A12 (CL-601), and CL-600-2B16 (CL-601-3A and CL-601-3R) Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22627; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-156-AD; Amendment 39-14425; AD 2005-26-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8069. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Aviointeriors S.p.A. (formerly ALVEN), Series 312 Box Mounted Seats, Correction [Docket No. FAA-20848; Directorate Identifier 2005-NE-02-AD; Amendment 39-14323; AD 2005-20-26] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8070. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-100, -200, -200C, -300, -400, and -500 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-20918; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-269-AD; Amendment 39-14539; AD 2006-07-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8071. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnel Douglas Model DC-9-10, DC-9-20, DC-9-30, DC-9-40, and DC-9-50 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-23197; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-109-AD; Amendment 39-14535; AD 2006-07-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8072. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A318-100 and A319-100 Series Airplanes; Model A320-111 Airplanes; and Model A320-200, A321-100, and A321-200 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22794; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-097-AD; Amendment 39-14536; AD 2006-07-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8073. 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 Aeries Airplanes) [Docket No. FAA-2006-24124; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-272-AD; Amendment 39-14534; AD 2006-07-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8074. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-81 (MD-81), DC-9-82 (MD-82), DC-9-83 (MD-83), DC-9-87 (MD-87), MD-88, and MD-90-30 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22062; Directorate Identifier 2003-NM-219-AD; Amendment 39-14538; AD 2006-07-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8075. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319-131, -132, and -133, A330-232 and -233; and A321-131, -231, and -232 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-23142; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-154-AD; Amendment 39-14532; AD 2006-07-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8076. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cirrus Design Corporation Models SR20 and SR22 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-23023; Directorate Identifier 2005-CE-49-AD; Amendment 39-14533; AD 2006-07-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8077. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310 Airplanes, Model A300 B4-600 Series Airplanes, Model A300 B4-600R Series Airplanes, Model A300 F4-600R Series Airplanes, and Model A300 C4-605R Variant F Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-24288; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-068-AD; Amendment 39-14540; AD 2006-07-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8078. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC-8-301, -311, and -315 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-20628; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-51-AD; Amendment 39-14529; AD 2006-07-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8079. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A321-100 and -200 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22456; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-128-AD; Amendment 39-14530; AD 2006-07-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8080. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-600, -700, -700C, -800, and -900 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-20110; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-114-AD; Amendment 39-14531; AD 2006-07-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8081. 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, -145MO, and -145EP Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-20728; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-003-AD; Amendment 39-14527; AD 2006-07-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8082. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A318-100 Series Airplanes; Model A319-100 Series Airplanes; Model A320-111 Airplanes; Model A320-200 Series Airplanes; Model A321-100 Series Airplanes; and Model A321-200 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-20453; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM270-AD; Amendment 39-14524; AD 2006-06-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8083. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330-200 and -300 Series Airplanes; and Model A340-200 and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-20452; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-206-AD; Amendment 39-14522; AD 2006-06-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8084. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A318-100 and A319-100 Series Airplanes, A320-111 Airplanes, A320-200 Series Airplanes, and A321-100 and A321-200 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-23314; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-189-AD; Amendment 39-14523; AD 2006-06-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8085. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Aerospatiale Model ATR72 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-21909; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-059-AD; Amendment 39-14521; AD 2006-06-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8086. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Implementation of the Great Lakes Legacy Act of 2002 [FRL-8163-8] received April 28, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8087. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System — Final Regulations to Establish Requirements for Cooling Water Intake Structures at Phase III Facilities [OW-2004-0002, FRL-8181-5] (RIN: 2040-AD70) received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 868. Resolution providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 861) declaring that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror, the struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary (Rept. 109–502). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KELLER (for himself, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 5603. A bill to temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California (for himself, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SIMMONS, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. PEARCE, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas):

H.R. 5604. A bill to require motor vehicle operators transporting security sensitive material in commerce to obtain a permit from the Secretary of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. WU (for himself and Mr. HALL):

H.R. 5605. A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to award grants to institutions of higher education to develop and offer education and training programs; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. HALL (for himself and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 5606. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 221 and 211 West Ferguson Street in Tyler, Texas, as the ''William M. Steger Federal Building and United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KUHL of New York:

H.R. 5607. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a $2,000 refundable credit for individuals who are active members of volunteer firefighting and emergency medical service organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALL (for himself and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 5608. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to intensify programs with respect to research and related activities concerning falls among older adults; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BONO (for herself and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 5609. A bill to require automobile dealers to disclose to consumers the presence of event data recorders, or ''black boxes'', on new automobiles, and to require manufacturers to provide the consumer with the option to enable and disable such devices on future automobiles; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (for herself, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. WATSON, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 5610. A bill to prevent sex offenders from using immigration laws to bring innocent, unsuspecting victims into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONAWAY (for himself, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HALL, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 5611. A bill to provide for the establishment of a partnership between the Secretary of Energy and appropriate industry groups for the creation of a transportation fuel conservation education campaign, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEAL of Georgia (for himself and Mr. NORWOOD):

H.R. 5612. A bill to establish the Mountaintown National Scenic Area in the Chattahoochee National Forest, Georgia, and to designate additional National Forest System land in the State of Georgia as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System; referred to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. GERLACH:

H.R. 5613. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a tax credit for charitable contributions to private, nonprofit charities providing health insurance premium assistance and drug co-payment assistance, thereby transitioning uninsured Americans into private insurance and transitioning Medicaid patients into private insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 5614. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to vest in the Coast Guard primary responsibility in the Federal Government for the naval defense of nuclear power facilities located on navigable waters of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 5615. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to waive the 24–month waiting period for Medicare coverage of individuals disabled with distant stage cancer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 5616. A bill to establish a National Commission on the Infrastructure of the United States; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself and Mr. DICKS):

H.R. 5617. A bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to provide an equitable distribution of land to the 13th Alaska Native Regional Corporation; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. THOMAS (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HART, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Miss MCMORRIS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. NEY, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. WELLER):

H. Con. Res. 430: Concurrent resolution recognizing the accomplishments of the American Council of Young Political Leaders for providing 40 years of international exchange programs, increasing international dialogue, and enhancing global understanding, and commemorating its 40th anniversary; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin (for herself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FORD, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. KIND, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MELANCON, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PETRI, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WATT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WOLF, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. RUSH):

H. Res. 867. Resolution honoring the life and accomplishments of James Cameron; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. MCCOTTER:

H. Res. 869. Resolution informing the American people of our Nation's progress in the world War on Terror, defining the situation and the stakes in the battle against the

terrorist enemy in the sovereign, democratic, and united nation of Iraq, and declaring the unwavering dedication of the United States to defend humanity, expand liberty, defeat the terrorist enemy, and win the world War on Terror; referred to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H. Res. 870. Resolution congratulating and commending the Port of Baltimore on the occasion of its 300th anniversary; to the Committee on Government Reform.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 5618. A bill to extend the patent term for the badge of the American Legion Women's Auxiliary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 5619. A bill to extend the patent term for the badge of the American Legion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 5620. A bill to extend the patent term for the badge of the Sons of the American Legion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 5621. A bill for the relief of Eqbal Shaikh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 517: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. HARMAN, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 550: Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 559: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 583: Mr. EDWARDS.

H.R. 676: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 699: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. CANNON.

H.R. 807: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 910: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 920: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 994: Mr. PICKERING, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. RENZI.

H.R. 1217: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 1264: Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 1298: Mr. PORTER, Mr. LEACH, and Miss MCMORRIS.

H.R. 1426: Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 1438: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 1996: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 2089: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 2206: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.R. 2230: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 2317: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2560: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 2717: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 2730: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 3379: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 3380: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H.R. 3437: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 3470: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 3471: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 3478: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3762: Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 4042: Mr. CARTER and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H.R. 4140: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 4157: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 4188: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 4304: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 4366: Mr. KIRK.

H.R. 4400: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 4435: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 4480: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H.R. 4517: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 4547: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 4583: Mr. SIMMONS.

H.R. 4597: Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 4600: Mr. WEXLER and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 4641: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 4739: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 4857: Mr. OSBORNE.

H.R. 4890: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 4903: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

H.R. 4956: Mr. BOOZMAN and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 4980: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 5005: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HERGER, Mr. AKIN, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 5009: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.

H.R. 5013: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 5022: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 5134: Mr. NORWOOD and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 5146: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 5159: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. PUTNAM.

H.R. 5182: Mr. CARDIN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. MCCRERY.

H.R. 5201: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 5225: Ms. HART, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 5230: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 5249: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 5291: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H.R. 5321: Mr. CLAY and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 5328: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BACA, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 5337: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BACA, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 5365: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 5388: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 5392: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 5402: Mr. JEFFERSON and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 5416: Mr. PORTER, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. ISSA, Mr. NUNES, Mr. RADANOVICH, and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 5417: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 5444: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 5455: Mr. BASS, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 5457: Mr. TERRY and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 5459: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 5466: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 5474: Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 5476: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 5526: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 5550: Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 5554: Mr. KLINE and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 5563: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 5573: Mr. ROSS and Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 5574: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 5588: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. CARSON, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BACA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CASE, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 5598: Mr. SHAYS.

H.J. Res. 58: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.J. Res. 73: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H. Con. Res. 222: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Con. Res. 340: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 388: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H. Con. Res. 390: Mr. SCHIFF.

H. Con. Res. 411: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. CARTER, Mr. GORDON, MS. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. TURNER, Mr. WELLER, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H. Con. Res. 415: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. ENGEL.

H. Con. Res. 416: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H. Res. 295: Mr. HINCHEY.

H. Res. 466: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H. Res. 723: Mr. REICHERT.

H. Res. 745: Mr. GORDON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. SHERWOOD.

H. Res. 825: Mr. MARSHALL.

H. Res. 863: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. CARSON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. PETERSON 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. 2048: Mr. STRICKLAND.