United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 17, 2007 No. 114

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 17, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HILDA L. SOLIS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 25 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate extend beyond 9:50 a.m.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

□ 1000

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Dr. Billy F. Hudgins, Cross Creek Community Church, Hokes Bluff, Alabama, offered the following prayer:

Lord, our gratitude to You for being in this place, and hallowed by the presence, and we're honored by the blessings that You bestow upon us and upon those that will be represented by the ones in the room.

Lord, our cry this morning is for Your wisdom. Our cry is for Your mercy, Your anointing so that the ones in this room may accomplish their task that's been assigned to them today with insight far greater than their own ingenuity and other provisions.

Lord, give to this House a spirit of unity that supersedes personal prejudice or party pressures so that Your divine purpose may be accomplished this day.

Lord, for those precious men and women serving in Iraq and other difficult global assignments, or for those protecting us here at home, guide them with a sense that their task is Yours.

And Lord, may the words of our mouth, the meditations of our heart be acceptable in Your sight, oh, Lord, our strength, our redeemer.

Lord, we pray these things in that sweet name of Jesus, Your son.

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.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. GINGREY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of ''National Purple Heart Recognition Day''.

S. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution commending the 1st Brigade Combat Team/34th Infantry Division of the Minnesota National Guard upon its completion of the longest continuous deployment of any United States military unit during Operation Iraqi Freedom.

The message also announced that pursuant to Executive Order 12131, as amended, the Chair reappoints the following Member to the President's Export Council:

The Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI).

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

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

Printed on recycled paper.

INTRODUCTION OF DR. BILLY FRANKLIN HUDGINS

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize our guest chaplain, Dr. Billy Franklin Hudgins. Dr. Hudgins has served selflessly as a pastor in Louisiana, South Carolina, and now in the district I represent in Alabama where he's the senior pastor of Cross Creek Community Church of Hokes Bluff, Alabama.

In addition to pastoral work, Dr. Hudgins has also been very involved with both State and national church leadership organizations. Among the honors he's received, he's served as president of the Alabama Baptist Convention Pastors Conference. He also served as trustee of the International Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention.

Dr. Hudgins has been a teacher and a coach over the course of his career. He has spent 5 years as a bi-vocational pastor and 35 years in churches belonging to the Southern Baptist Convention. If that wasn't enough, at a time when others look toward retirement, at the age of 60, Dr. Bill Hudgins helped start the church he currently serves in Hokes Bluff.

Dr. Hudgins is joined in Washington today by his wife, Connie, with whom he'll be celebrating 46 years of marriage in a matter of weeks. I'm honored to welcome Dr. Billy Hudgins as our guest here in the United States House of Representatives this morning as someone who is a servant and has spent his career as a follower of Jesus, and one who has helped others do the same along life's way.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches.

TROOP WITHDRAWAL STRATEGY

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

Mr. SESTAK. Mr. Speaker, ending this tragic misadventure in Iraq is necessary but insufficient. How and the means by which we end it is of even greater importance, both to the safety of our troops and to our overall strategic security.

First, our troops. It took us 6 months to extract 6,000 troops out of Somalia after Blackhawk Down, and we inserted 17,000 personnel to guard the retreat. We have not only 160,000 troops in Iraq, but over 100,000 civilians. We must ensure their safety, and that will take approximately 1 year.

Second, that time line of a year is actually the change in strategy that will ensure that we have an aftermath, if we pursue diplomacy with Iran and Syria, to bring about an unfailed state. Recently the intelligence community said Iran does not want a failed government. Therefore, we must approach the end of this war with a strategic approach working with the Republicans. This is our country's war, because the aftermath of its consequences are so great and it requires a strategic end.

MINNESOTA NATIONAL GUARD RETURNS AFTER 16-MONTH DEPLOYMENT TO IRAQ

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

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 2,600 men and women of the Minnesota National Guard who, after serving our country with great honor and courage, are returning home from their 16-month deployment to Iraq.

Last Friday my friend and colleague, Congressman TIM WALZ, and I had the privilege of visiting Volk Field near Fort McCoy in Wisconsin and welcoming home soldiers from the 1st Brigade Combat Team, 34th Infantry Division, the famed ''Red Bulls.'' It was truly a memorable experience greeting these proud soldiers as they returned from the longest combat deployment of any Army brigade combat team in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Minnesota's ''Red Bulls'' escorted supply convoys and traveled 2.4 million miles in Iraq. Other members of the BCT provided essential security to U.S. bases throughout the country.

Speaking with the fine men and women of the ''Red Bulls'' as they stepped off the plane and smelled that clean, fresh air and stepped on American soil, it became clear that these soldiers are justifiably proud of their accomplishments. The great State of Minnesota and all Americans can be proud as well.

HONORING ROBERT CAUSOR, JR.

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

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Robert Causor, Jr., a paratrooper rifleman with the 82nd Airborne Division who was killed July 7 by a homemade bomb in Samarra, Iraq.

Robert was born and grew up in San Jose, California. Since childhood, he dreamed of being a soldier, and after graduating from Overfelt High School he enlisted to serve in Iraq. Despite worries from his family, Robert was determined to fulfill his lifelong dream.

To Robert, service in the military was a way to repay his country for the successes of his family. He came from a close family, one of 26 cousins who lived in San Jose for over three decades.

On behalf of California's 16th Congressional District, I offer Robert's family our deepest condolences as they deal with this painful loss. He will be decorated with many honors, including a Bronze Star and a Purple Heart, but today our thoughts and our prayers are with his parents, the rest of his family and his friends.

CONTINUING TO FIGHT TERRORISM ACROSS THE WORLD

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind my colleagues that we are engaged in what truly is a global war on terrorism. The war in which we are fighting does not have borders. It is not contained to Iraq and Afghanistan. Again last week the United Kingdom reported that up to eight police officers and several public officials were uncovered with ties to extremist groups, including al Qaeda, who may have also attended terror training camps in Pakistan and Afghanistan.

Everyone should be concerned about the recent series of suicide bombings in northwest Pakistan. Al Qaeda has established safe havens in the border areas of Pakistan, a nuclear armed nation. The tribal area of North Waziristan announced on Sunday that they are ending a 10-month ceasefire with the government. These terrorist attacks follow last week's mass murder of police officers in Algeria, and the beheading of 10 Army personnel in the Philippines. Americans must face the threat that modern civilization is under attack worldwide.

I am proud of our brave men and women in uniform who fight daily to ensure that American families are protected.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we'll never forget September the 11th.

COST OF THE WAR IN IRAQ

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

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Speaker, the war in Iraq has cost, as of last week, every man, woman and child in my district, New York's 19th district, $3,077. Now, for that $3,077, the men, women and children of my district have paid for a war that was a strategic mistake and has been horribly mismanaged.

In the latest example, USA Today revealed that the Pentagon has been even slower than we thought in providing safer vehicles for our troops. According to e-mails within the Pentagon, a Marine general in Iraq requested MRAPs, mine resistant ambush protected vehicles, as far back as December 2003. These vehicles offer the best protection from IEDs for our troops. The number one killer of troops in Iraq are IEDs.

However, while Pentagon leadership delayed in providing these vehicles to U.S. troops, they decided to equip the Iraqi Army with these vehicles, while leaving our soldiers with Humvees. This resulted in the unnecessary deaths of at least 600 Americans.

For $3,000, the taxpayers of my district paid for the best equipment we could buy for the Iraqi Army, but left our soldiers and marines with substandard Humvees. It is time we reorient our priorities, protect our own soldiers, and end this war.

END CURRENCY MANIPULATION AND LEVEL THE PLAYING FIELD

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, currency manipulation by our foreign competitors is creating difficult challenges for our country's manufacturing base, particularly our domestic auto industry.

The Wall Street Journal reported in June that ''a cheap yen is making it advantageous for Toyota to increase manufacturing capability and to export cars from Japan, and that it is much more profitable to produce cars in Japan and ship them all to the United States right now.''

And what is the response of the Congress to this threat against the American automotive industry which is directly responsible for the employment of millions of American jobs?

Well, the Democrats control the Congress, and the Democratic leadership has decided that Detroit doesn't have enough on its plate right now. Instead of trying to level the playing field, Democrats want to pile on unworkable new CAFE standards on the domestic auto industry.

Higher CAFE standards will not reduce our dependence on foreign oil, but they will steal investment dollars from technologies that could transform the entire automobile industry and level the global automotive market.

I urge my colleagues to reject this misguided policy and stand up for American manufacturing companies, stand up for American jobs.

□ 1015

IRAQ IS DISTRACTING US FROM PROTECTING THE HOMELAND AND FIGHTING GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

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

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, an interim report last week by the White House confirmed what most observers believe, that the situation in Iraq is not improving. The Iraqi Government has failed to meet the political benchmarks endorsed by the President last January. The Iraqi security forces continue to perform below expected levels. But the President continues to ask us stubbornly to stay the course.

At the same time, U.S. troops are overextended, many having served multiple tours in Iraq. This is unfair to our soldiers, their families, and dangerous for our national security. As Major General John Batiste recently noted, ''Iraq is distracting America from what should be the focus . . . It is in America's best interest to rethink our national strategy, deliberately disengage from Iraq, refit and rearm the military, get serious about homeland security, and prepare to win the next phase of the struggle.

Last week this House voted to do exactly that. This Democratic House joins with the American people and our retired generals in demanding a new direction in Iraq. This week the Senate can join us by supporting the Levin-Reed amendment.

OPERATION SMILE

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

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 25th anniversary of Operation Smile, a worldwide children's medical charity headquartered in Norfolk, Virginia, that repairs cleft lips and cleft palates for children and young adults in developing countries.

Founded in 1982 by Dr. William Magee, Jr., a plastic surgeon, and his wife, Kathleen, a nurse and clinical social worker, Operation Smile has grown from humble beginnings into a worldwide children's medical charity whose network of medical volunteers are dedicated to helping improve the health and lives of children worldwide.

Operation Smile has helped more than 100,000 children and young adults in 30 developing countries overcome their physical irregularities. The organization now operates one of the world's largest volunteer networks, utilizing more than 5,000 medical and nonmedical professionals around the world.

I commend the Magees for their passion to improve the health and lives of children and young adults worldwide. Through Operation Smile, their efforts over the past 25 years have offered new life and new hope to those suffering from facial deformities.

REPUBLICANS CONTINUE TO MOVE AWAY FROM BUSH ON IRAQ; ACTION SPEAKS LOUDER THAN WORDS

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, Democratic efforts to change direction in Iraq forced the President to issue a preliminary report showing that the Iraqis have not met the benchmarks that they were supposed to. The failure of the Iraqi Government to keep its promises, coupled with continued violence on the ground, the death of our soldiers and Iraqi civilians has led Senate Republicans, at least some of them, to join us in calling for a new direction in Iraq.

Some Senate Republicans see the writing on the wall, writing on the wall in both of our House cloakrooms, but is yet to be seen on the Republican side but for four of our colleagues, for the optometrist hasn't made his way over there. The situation is getting worse for our troops. We will see this week whether Senate Republicans mean what they say and they vote for the Levin-Reed amendment when it comes to the Senate floor tomorrow and bring our troops home. The amendment is close to identical with what the House passed with Democratic votes and four Republicans last week.

The Iraqi Prime Minister Maliki has said they can supply their own defense and they don't need us any longer. When a host says go home, it is only correct to go home. He says they don't need us. We aren't needed. We need to bring our troops home and not have them needlessly die.

MT. SINAI BAPTIST CHURCH

(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 this morning to pay tribute to Mt. Sinai Baptist Church of Marietta, Georgia, celebrating 143 years of spiritual service to our community.

The history of Mt. Sinai reaches back nearly as far as the history of Marietta itself. In 1864, 1 year before the Civil War ended, a group of black slaves gathered in the backwoods of Georgia and they began their own worship service, and by 1873 the now freed slaves built Mt. Sinai Baptist Church on a plot of land south of Marietta.

They were not content to merely be a house of worship. Mt. Sinai created a school to educate the children of former slaves and became a central gathering place for the whole community.

Mr. Speaker, today Mt. Sinai Baptist Church carries on that tradition as a spiritual and communal leader in Marietta. Currently under the guidance of Pastor Albert Johnson, the church is upholding its legacy of education and outreach, the same commitment that it has displayed for nearly 1½ centuries.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join me today in congratulating the Mt. Sinai Baptist Church on 143 years of service and request that they have at least 143 more.

THE TRUE COSTS OF THE WAR IN IRAQ TO OUR MILITARY AND TO THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, over the last week, we have seen more proof of the devastating effects that war in Iraq is having on our Nation's budget and military.

Last week CRS reported that the average monthly cost of the Iraq War is now $10 billion a month. That means this year alone, the Bush administration has already spent $60 billion in Iraq. Just imagine how we could have used $60 billion here at home? We could have improved a lot of Americans' lives and addressed our deficit.

The war is also negatively impacting our military. Last week the Army announced it missed its recruiting goals for the 2nd month in a row, falling 1,000 recruits shy of its June goals.

Mr. Speaker, the status quo cannot continue in Iraq. That's why Democrats have repeatedly tried to change the direction of the war, with little help from our friends across the aisle. How much worse do things have to get before congressional Republicans stop blindly following President Bush?

The warning signs of change have been in the air for months. But Republicans refuse to see them.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SERGEANT WILLIAM ''BILL'' ZAPFE

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

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to honor the life of Sergeant First Class William ''Bill'' Zapfe. Sergeant Zapfe was serving with the Army's 3rd Infantry Division as a combat engineer when he was tragically killed by an improvised explosive device last month. Sergeant Zapfe was a dedicated soldier on his third tour in Iraq.

Bill grew up in Park Hills and Dry Ridge, Kentucky, and joined the military shortly after graduating from high school. He came from a family of dedicated public servants. His late father, Joseph, was a State trooper, and his two brothers, Joseph and Edward, have also both dutifully served our Nation. He is remembered by his family as a loving and devoted husband and father. Bill Zapfe is a true patriot who died fighting for a cause he believed in. Bill leaves behind his mother, Jeanne; his loving wife, Evelyn; and his three children, Anastasia, Cameron, and Spencer.

Today, as we honor the life of Sergeant Zapfe, our thoughts and prayers are with his family and friends during this difficult time.

We thank Sergeant Zapfe for his service and for answering the call to protect our great Nation.

INTERIM REPORT SHOWS THAT A NEW DIRECTION IS NEEDED IN IRAQ

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, last week the White House released an interim report on Iraq that unfortunately reaffirms what we have known for quite some time: The President's troop escalation plan is not working and we are desperately in need of a new direction in Iraq.

Since the President announced his surge 6 months ago, we have lost 600 American troops and spent another $60 billion. And yet by the Bush administration's own admission, there is unsatisfactory progress on all of the political reconciliation benchmarks announced by the President in January.

Mr. Speaker, just days after this report was released, the White House once again asked for more time to pursue the President's failed strategy. But the American people and this Democratic Congress know that more time and lower standards are no substitute for real progress.

It is time for a new direction in Iraq. The House acted last week. The Senate has the opportunity this week. They should join us in changing course.

SCHIP TAX INCREASE

(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, as the body here begins the debate on the SCHIP reauthorization plan, separate from Medicaid, I would encourage my colleagues not to lose sight of the purpose of this program, which is insuring underprivileged children.

When we created this program in 1997, it was intended to provide health insurance for children at or around 200 percent of the poverty line. Today in States like Minnesota, almost 40,000 people are enrolled in SCHIP; 34,000 of them are adults.

The Democrats want to expand this program up to 400 percent of the Federal poverty line. This type of expansion would allow a family of four with an income level of more than $80,000 to be eligible for the SCHIP program in some parts of this country.

Let's get our priorities straight. We want to provide insurance for underprivileged children, not adults who can afford to pay for it themselves.

LET'S FOCUS ON THE REAL THREAT

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, President Bush said last week al Qaeda in Iraq attacked us on 9/11.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The truth is there was no al Qaeda in Iraq on 9/11. In fact, we helped create al Qaeda in Iraq by our invasion. And what we are going to learn today from our intelligence service report is 4 years in Iraq has made al Qaeda stronger around the world.

So let's get our facts straight in this war and focus on the real threat in a smart and intelligent way.

NYPD OFFICER RUSSEL TIMOSHENKO

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, those who wear the badge of a peace officer do so with valor and the determination to serve their community. NYPD Officer Russel Timoshenko was one of those peace officers.

Officer Timoshenko chose to be an American citizen and legally immigrated to the United States from Russia in 1993. He followed the law to get here and then became a protector of the law as a member of New York City's Finest.

Around 2:30 a.m., Tuesday, July 10, 2007 Officers Timoshenko and Herman Yan stopped an SUV on a dark New York City street. As the officers approached the SUV, the passengers turned and gunned down both officers. Officer Yan was shot in the chest and arm, and he will recover. Russel Timoshenko was shot twice in the face, and Saturday the 23-year-old officer died. He had been a New York City cop for only 18 months. Two outlaws have been arrested for murder.

Mr. Speaker, Officer Russel Timoshenko was the American Dream, a naturalized citizen who dedicated his life and service to American citizens. America can use more American immigrant citizens who wear the badge.

And that's just the way it is.

COLORECTAL CANCER SCREENING AND DETECTION COVERAGE ACT

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

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express the importance of access to colorectal cancer screening tests for Americans.

Like far too many other Americans, my life has been touched by cancer. Nine years ago I lost my mother, Janna, to colon cancer. I understand too well the importance of catching cancer early.

Colorectal cancer is a leading killer in the United States that will unnecessarily take the lives of more than 52,000 of our constituents. This is a tragedy because we have every tool necessary to prevent suffering and almost all death from this disease.

Last September I took very seriously the fact that I signed the 2015 Pledge to

do anything possible to eliminate suffering and death due to cancer by the year 2015. Today I take a step in that direction.

Twenty-two States and the District of Columbia have protections in place to provide access to screening and early detection for colorectal cancer. It is time that the rest of the country has the same access that could save their lives.

Please join me and my friend from Texas, Mr. RALPH HALL, as we introduce the Colorectal Cancer Screening and Detection Coverage Act.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

(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, today the liberal leadership of this House will call up H.R. 980, the Public Safety Employee-Employer Cooperation Act.

It sounds harmless. But let's not mince words. This bill is not concerned with public safety. It's a payoff from the left to the powerful labor unions that finance many of their campaigns.

The liberal leadership already bowed to union pressure by passing legislation to strip workers of the right to vote in a private ballot election. Now they are attempting to federalize collective bargaining for public safety professionals.

The International Association of Chiefs of Police opposes the legislation because it would effectively take power from State and local governments during labor-management relations. I oppose it because it will likely make our communities less safe.

Mr. Speaker, there is a time and there is a place for politics, but not when our lives and the safety of our communities is at stake.

□ 1030

SENATE HAS A CHANCE TO TAKE ACTION TO CHANGE THE COURSE OF THE WAR IN IRAQ

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, for weeks now, the Republican Senators have been coming forward saying that the status quo in Iraq cannot continue. They're right. This week they have an opportunity to act on those words. We'll see if they join us in changing the course of the war, or if they find another excuse as to why they must continue to support President Bush's failed policy. I would hope that they would stand by their words.

Senator LUGAR correctly stated, ''The President and some of his advisers may be tempted to pursue the surge strategy to the end of his administration, but such a course contains extreme risks for United States national security.'' Senator VOINOVICH correctly stated, ''A policy of responsive military disengagement, with a corresponding increase in nonmilitary support, is the best way to advance our Nation's interests in Iraq and achieve our primary goals.'' Senator DOMENICI again correctly stated, ''There's nothing to wait for.''

We agree. That's why this House voted last week to bring most of our troops home by next April. The Senate has the chance to take that same action this week. I hope that these Senators will stand by their words and join us in changing the course.

BUSH ANNOUNCES THAT IRAQ HAS NOT MET ONE OF THE BENCHMARKS THEY PROMISED TO MEET

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, last week, the President's preliminary progress report on Iraq showed no progress at all. In fact, the Bush administration admitted that the Iraqi government failed to meet any of its targets for political or economic progress.

You would think that this report would serve as a wake-up call to the Bush administration. It hasn't. It's clear that President Bush does not want to change a thing. In fact, the Washington Post reported that the administration is not considering a strategic change, but simply a shift in message.

Mr. Speaker, the failures in Iraq have nothing to do with message. President Bush promised that the Iraqi government would meet these benchmarks when he announced his troop escalation plan earlier this year. Many of us were skeptical that the Iraqis would actually follow through. And now that it's clear that the government has failed to meet any of the benchmarks, a shift in message is simply not enough.

Democrats have a plan to bring our troops home by April of next year. It's time for the Iraqis to take accountability for their own country. And that's why we passed the Republican Redeployment Act last week, and the Senate should follow our lead this week.

BOEHNER CALLING SENATORS ''WIMPS''; HOUSE REPUBLICANS REFUSE TO CHANGE COURSE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that 70 percent of Americans support withdrawing almost all U.S. troops from Iraq by April, and despite a growing number of retired generals and senior Republican Senators joining Democrats in calling for a new strategy in Iraq, many House Republicans remain staunchly in favor of the President's failed Iraq policy. In fact, just last week, the leader of the House Republicans referred to the Senate Republicans who have spoken out against President Bush's failed policy as ''wimps.'' And it begs the question, doesn't the minority leader believe 70 percent of Americans and numerous retired generals are wimps as well?

It's a much easier thing to toe the line and keep rubber-stamping the President's failed Iraq policy, as many Republicans in this body continue to do. It's a lot easier to do that than break from your party and the will of our President to take a principled stand for what you believe. Those Republicans who are against the President's policies are the true patriots.

Mr. Speaker, despite the name calling, Democrats will continue to push for a responsible redeployment of U.S. troops from Iraq, and we hope that some of our Republican colleagues here in the House will join with us.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYER-EMPLOYEE COOPERATION ACT OF 2007

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 980) to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 980

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act of 2007''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Labor-management relationships and partnerships are based on trust, mutual respect, open communication, bilateral consensual problem solving, and shared accountability. In many public safety agencies it is the union that provides the institutional stability as elected leaders and appointees come and go.

(2) State and local public safety officers play an essential role in the efforts of the United States to detect, prevent, and respond to terrorist attacks, and to respond to natural disasters, hazardous materials, and other mass casualty incidents. As the first to arrive on scene, State and local public safety officers must be prepared to protect life and property and to preserve scarce and vital Federal resources, avoid substantial and debilitating interference with

interstate and foreign commerce, and to protect the national security of the United States. Public safety employer-employee cooperation is essential in meeting these needs and is, therefore, in the National interest.

(3) The health and safety of the Nation and the best interests of public safety employers and employees may be furthered by the settlement of issues through the processes of collective bargaining.

(4) The Federal Government is in the position to encourage conciliation, mediation, and voluntary arbitration to aid and encourage employers and the representatives of their employees to reach and maintain agreements concerning rates of pay, hours, and working conditions, and to make all reasonable efforts through negotiations to settle their differences by mutual agreement reached through collective bargaining or by such methods as may be provided for in any applicable agreement for the settlement of disputes.

(5) The potential absence of adequate cooperation between public safety employers and employees has implications for the security of employees, impacts the upgrading of police and fire services of local communities, the health and well-being of public safety officers, and the morale of the fire and police departments, and can affect interstate and intrastate commerce.

(6) Many States and localities already provide public safety officers with collective bargaining rights comparable to or greater than the rights and responsibilities set forth in this Act, and such State laws should be respected.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) The term ''Authority'' means the Federal Labor Relations Authority.

(2) The term ''public safety officer''—

(A) means an employee of a public safety agency who is a law enforcement officer, a firefighter, or emergency medical services personnel;

(B) includes an individual who is temporarily transferred to a supervisory or management position; and

(C) does not include a permanent supervisory or management employee.

(3) The term ''firefighter'' has the same meaning given the term ''employee in fire protection activities'' defined in section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act (29 U.S.C. 203(y)).

(4) The term ''emergency medical services personnel'' means an individual who provides out-of-hospital emergency medical care, including an emergency medical technician, paramedic, or first responder.

(5) The term ''law enforcement officer'' has the same meaning given such term in section 1204(5) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796b(5)).

(6) The term ''supervisory employee'' has the meaning given such term, or a substantially equivalent term, under applicable State law on the date of enactment of this Act. In the absence of such State law on the date of enactment of this Act, the term means an individual, employed by a public safety employer, who—

(A) has the authority in the interest of the employer to hire, direct, assign, promote, reward, transfer, furlough, lay off, recall, suspend, discipline, or remove public safety officers, to adjust their grievances, or to effectively recommend such action, if the exercise of the authority is not merely routine or clerical in nature but requires the consistent exercise of independent judgment; and

(B) devotes a preponderance of employment time exercising such authority.

(7) The term ''management employee'' has the meaning given such term, or a substantially equivalent term, under applicable State law in effect on the date of enactment of this Act. If no such State law is in effect, the term means an individual employed by a public safety employer in a position that requires or authorizes the individual to formulate, determine, or influence the policies of the employer.

(8) The terms ''employer'' and ''public safety agency'' mean any State, political subdivision of a State, the District of Columbia, or any territory or possession of the United States that employs public safety officers.

(9) The term ''labor organization'' means an organization composed in whole or in part of employees, in which employees participate, and the purpose of which is to represent such employees before public safety agencies concerning grievances, conditions of employment and related matters.

(10) The term ''substantially provides'' means substantial compliance with the rights and responsibilities described in section 4(b).

SEC. 4. DETERMINATION OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) DETERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Authority shall make a determination as to whether a State substantially provides for the rights and responsibilities described in subsection (b). In making such determinations, the Authority shall consider the opinion of affected employers and labor organizations. Where the Authority is notified by an employer and an affected labor organization that both parties agree that the law applicable to such employer and labor organization substantially provides for the rights and responsibilities described in subsection (b), the Authority shall give such agreement weight to the maximum extent practicable in making its determination under this subsection.

(2) SUBSEQUENT DETERMINATIONS.—(A) A determination made pursuant to paragraph (1) shall remain in effect unless and until the Authority issues a subsequent determination, in accordance with the procedures set forth in subparagraph (B).

(B) An employer or a labor organization may submit a written request for a subsequent determination, on the basis of a material change in State law or its interpretation. If the Authority determines that a material change in State law or its interpretation has occurred, the Authority shall issue a subsequent determination not later than 30 days after receipt of such request.

(3) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Any person aggrieved by a determination of the Authority under this section may, during the 60-day period beginning on the date on which the determination was made, petition any United States Court of Appeals in the circuit in which the person resides or transacts business or in District of Columbia circuit, for judicial review. In any judicial review of a determination by the Authority, the procedures contained in section 7123(c) of title 5, United States Code, shall be followed.

(b) RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES.—In making a determination described in subsection (a), the Authority shall consider a State's law to provide adequate rights and responsibilities unless such law fails to substantially provide rights and responsibilities comparable to or greater than each of the following:

(1) Granting public safety officers the right to form and join a labor organization, which may exclude management and supervisory employees, that is, or seeks to be, recognized as the exclusive bargaining representative of such employees.

(2) Requiring public safety employers to recognize the employees' labor organization (freely chosen by a majority of the employees), to agree to bargain with the labor organization, and to commit any agreements to writing in a contract or memorandum of understanding.

(3) Providing for bargaining over hours, wages, and terms and conditions of employment.

(4) Making available an interest impasse resolution mechanism, such as fact-finding, mediation, arbitration, or comparable procedures.

(5) Requiring enforcement through State courts of—

(A) all rights, responsibilities, and protections provided by State law and enumerated in this subsection; and

(B) any written contract or memorandum of understanding.

(c) FAILURE TO MEET REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Authority determines, acting pursuant to its authority under subsection (a), that a State does not substantially provide for the rights and responsibilities described in subsection (b), such State shall be subject to the regulations and procedures described in section 5.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraph (1) shall apply in each State on the later of—

(A) 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(B) the date of the end of the first regular session of the legislature of that State that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. ROLE OF THE AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Authority shall issue regulations establishing procedures which provide the rights and responsibilities described in section 4(b) for public safety employers and officers in States which the Authority has determined, acting pursuant to its authority under section 4(a), do not substantially provide for such rights and responsibilities.

(b) ROLE OF THE FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY.—The Authority, to the extent provided in this Act and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Authority, shall—

(1) determine the appropriateness of units for labor organization representation;

(2) supervise and conduct elections to determine whether a labor organization has been selected as an exclusive representative by a voting majority of the employees in an appropriate unit;

(3) resolve issues relating to the duty to bargain in good faith;

(4) conduct hearings and resolve complaints of unfair labor practices;

(5) resolve exceptions to the awards of arbitrators;

(6) protect the right of each employee to form, join, or assist any labor organization, or to refrain from any such activity, freely and without fear of penalty or reprisal, and protect each employee in the exercise of such right;

(7) if the Authority finds that any State is not in compliance with the regulations prescribed under subsection (a), direct compliance by such State by order; and

(8) take such other actions as are necessary and appropriate to effectively administer this Act, including issuing subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary or other evidence from any place in the United States, and administering oaths, taking or ordering the taking of depositions, ordering responses to written interrogatories, and receiving and examining witnesses.

(c) ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) PETITION BY AUTHORITY.—If a State fails to comply with a final order issued by the Authority, the Authority shall petition any United States Court of Appeals with jurisdiction over the parties or the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit to enforce any final orders under this section, and for appropriate temporary relief or a restraining order. Any petition under this section shall be conducted in accordance with section 7123(c) and (d) of title 5, United States Code, except that any final order of the Authority with respect to questions of fact shall be found to be conclusive unless the court determines that the Authority's decision was arbitrary and capricious.

(2) RIGHT OF ACTION.—Unless the Authority has filed a petition for enforcement as provided in paragraph (1), any interested party shall have the right to file suit against any political subdivision of a State, or, if the State has waived its sovereign immunity, against the State

itself, in any district court of the United States of competent jurisdiction to enforce compliance with the regulations issued by the Authority pursuant to subsection (b), to enforce compliance with any order issued by the Authority pursuant to this section, or to enforce section 6 of this Act. The right provided by this paragraph to bring a suit to enforce compliance with any order issued by the Authority pursuant to this section shall terminate upon the filing of a petition seeking the same relief by the Authority under paragraph (1).

SEC. 6. STRIKES AND LOCKOUTS PROHIBITED.

Notwithstanding any rights or responsibilities provided under State law or under regulations issued by the Authority under section 5—

(1) a public safety employer may not engage in a lockout of public safety officers;

(2) public safety officers may not engage in a strike against such public safety employer; and

(3) a labor organization may not call for a strike by public safety officers against their public safety employer.

SEC. 7. EXISTING COLLECTIVE BARGAINING UNITS AND AGREEMENTS.

This Act and the regulations issued under this Act shall not be construed to invalidate a certification, recognition, collective bargaining agreement, or memorandum of understanding which has been issued, approved, or ratified by any public employee relations board or commission or by any State or political subdivision or its agents (management officials) in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, or the results of any election held before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8. CONSTRUCTION, COMPLIANCE, AND ENFORCEMENT.

(a) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or the regulations issued under this Act shall be construed—

(1) to preempt or limit the remedies, rights, and procedures of any law of any State or political subdivision of any State or jurisdiction that substantially provides greater or comparable rights and responsibilities described in section 4(b);

(2) to prevent a State from enforcing a State law which prohibits employers and labor organizations from negotiating provisions in a labor agreement that require union membership or payment of union fees as a condition of employment;

(3) to preempt any State law in effect on the date of enactment of this Act that substantially provides for the rights and responsibilities described in section 4(b) solely because—

(A) such State law permits an employee to appear in his or her own behalf with respect to his or her employment relations with the public safety agency involved;

(B) such State law excludes from its coverage employees of a state militia or national guard;

(C) such rights and responsibilities have not been extended to other categories of employees covered by this Act, in which case the Authority shall only exercise the powers provided in section 5 of this Act with respect to those categories of employees who have not been afforded the rights and responsibilities described in section 4(b); or

(D) such laws or ordinances provide that a contract or memorandum of understanding between a public safety employer and a labor organization must be presented to a legislative body as part of the process for approving such contract or memorandum of understanding;

(4) to permit parties subject to the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) and the regulations under such Act to negotiate provisions that would prohibit an employee from engaging in part-time employment or volunteer activities during off-duty hours;

(5) to require a State to rescind or preempt laws or ordinances of any of its political subdivisions if such laws substantially provide rights and responsibilities for public safety officers that are comparable to or greater than the rights and responsibilities enumerated in section 4(b) of this Act; or

(6) preempt any State law that substantially provides for the rights and responsibilities described in section 4(b) solely because such law does not require bargaining with respect to pension and retirement benefits.

(b) PARTIAL EXEMPTION.—A State may exempt from its State law, or from the requirements established under this Act, a political subdivision of the State that has a population of less than 5,000 or that employs fewer than 25 full time employees. For purposes of this subsection, the term ''employees'' includes each individual employed by the political subdivision except any individual elected by popular vote or appointed to serve on a board or commission.

(c) ENFORCEMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of the Act, and in the absence of a waiver of a State's sovereign immunity, the Authority shall have the exclusive power to enforce the provisions of this Act with respect to public safety officers employed by a State.

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material relevant to H.R. 980 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be sponsor of H.R. 980, along with my good friend from Tennessee, Mr. JOHN DUNCAN.

H.R. 980 extends to firefighters, police officers, corrections officers and other public safety officers the basic right to discuss workplace issues with their employers. Public safety officers, who risk their lives to protect us, deserve a say in decisions that affect their lives and their livelihood.

We have addressed concerns raised during the hearing held on the legislation in the Education and Labor Committee and strengthened this strongly bipartisan bill. This bipartisanship of this legislation is demonstrated by the 280 cosponsors of this bill and a 42–1 bipartisan vote in favor of this bill during the markup in the Education and Labor Committee.

I would like to thank Chairman MILLER, Chairman ANDREWS and the committee staff for all their support on this important legislation. I wish to also thank Ranking Member MCKEON and Ranking Member KLINE and their staff for their work with us on this legislation.

I first introduced this legislation more than a decade ago back in 1995. It has been a long journey to today, and this legislation is long overdue for our Nation's public safety employees.

I would also like to thank the groups that we have worked with on this legislation, including, among others, the International Association of Firefighters, the Fraternal Order of Police, the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, the International Union of Police Associations and the National Association of Police Organizations.

The absence of the right to collectively bargain denies these public servants the opportunity to influence decisions that affect their work and their family. Our firefighters and police officers risk their lives to keep us safe, yet there are some States in this country that deny them the right to discuss workplace issues with their employers, a right most Americans have. At the very least, they should be allowed to negotiate for wages, hours and safe working conditions.

When I was in the State legislature in Michigan, I helped pass legislation that granted all public employees the right to collectively bargain. In Michigan, this has led to a working environment that effectively protects the public and that both employers and employees are proud of.

H.R. 980 would merely create a minimum standard that States have the flexibility to implement, regulate and enforce as they see fit. Many States, such as my own State of Michigan, have laws in place that go well beyond H.R. 980, and these States would not be affected by this legislation. Additionally, this legislation does not allow strikes or lockouts, and it preserves management rights.

Firefighters and police officers are very serious about their commitment to public safety. They deserve the basic right to sit down with their employers and discuss their work conditions.

The reasonableness of this legislation again is demonstrated by the wide bipartisan support it has from its 280 cosponsors. I urge my colleagues to join me in passing this legislation.

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

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

I rise today in strong support of this legislation. I'm proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 980, the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act of 2007.

Firefighters and police officers put their lives on the line to protect us, and they deserve the right to collectively bargain for safe working conditions and fair wages.

Recent events remind us of their heroism. It was a week ago today that a plane crashed into two homes in Sanford, Florida, just outside my hometown of Orlando, Florida. An off-duty firefighter named Ryan Cooper was nearby when he heard the plane roaring toward the houses. As the airplane smashed the two homes and exploded

them into flames, Ryan Cooper went into action. He rushed into the smoldering homes and brought out a 10-year year-old boy and his father.

Firefighter Ryan Cooper is a true hero. From his hospital bed, where he was being treated for smoke inhalation, Mr. Cooper humbly said that any firefighter would have done the same thing.

Sometimes firefighters pay the ultimate sacrifice. Just last month, nine firefighters in Charleston, South Carolina lost their lives fighting a blaze at a furniture store. These acts of heroism highlight the dangerous nature of public safety officers' jobs.

This legislation gets the ball in the strike zone. On the one hand, it allows firefighters and police officers to collectively bargain for better working conditions and fair wages. On the other hand, it expressly outlaws strikes, and it does not overturn State right-to-work laws. In short, this bill is fair and reasonable and deserves our bipartisan support.

Finally, let me address the main concern raised by some folks about this legislation. They say that this legislation would mandate compulsory unionism in right-to-work States. That simply isn't the case. Section 8, subsections 2 and 3, specifically state that this legislation would not preempt State right-to-work laws. In other words, this legislation allows States to enforce laws that prevent employers and unions from requiring union fees as a condition of employment.

Many people confuse collective bargaining with right to work. The two can coexist. For example, firefighters currently enjoy collective bargaining rights in my home State of Florida, yet Florida is a right-to-work State.

In closing, I would like to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for all his hard work on this bill. Mr. KILDEE has been a tireless advocate for this legislation.

I would also like to thank the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. MILLER, and the majority staff for working with the minority to make some changes and improvements in this bill, particularly those that address issues which were raised during consideration of this bill in committee. I would also like to thank the lead Republican cosponsor of this legislation, Mr. JIMMY DUNCAN from Tennessee, for his work.

I will be voting for H.R. 980 today, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

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

Mr. KILDEE. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. KELLER for his hard work on this bill. He has made it a joy working on the bill, and I thank him for that.

I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman of the Health, Employment, Labor and Pensions Subcommittee that had jurisdiction over this bill, such time as he may consume.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to begin by thanking Mr. KELLER for his strong statement of support of the legislation, Mr. DUNCAN for his very vigorous advocacy of this bill, Mr. MCKEON for his cooperation in getting it here today, obviously Chairman MILLER for his leadership, and especially my friend and colleague from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

For Mr. KILDEE, this has been a 12-year effort, an endurance test, where he has built a coalition of all different kinds of groups across party lines and around the country for a very worthy piece of legislation. So Mr. Speaker, I would commend my good friend for his persistence and congratulate him on a job beautifully done on this legislation.

There is a strong bipartisan consensus for this legislation because it's all about common sense.

Mr. Speaker, most Americans would agree that, almost without exception, every American should have the right to bargain collectively and organize and join or not join a union. This legislation gives that right to our career firefighters, police officers, emergency service personnel, corrections officers, and other public safety officials.

□ 1045

There is a commonsense consensus that because of the significant work that these individuals do, they should not have the right to strike if there is a difficult contract negotiation. Under this bill they do not. There is not a right to strike created by this bill because we recognize the difficulty that strikes would create in the public safety field.

There is a commonsense consensus that there should not be a one-size-fits-all national rule to govern police officers, firefighters and public safety personnel in each of the 50 States and other jurisdictions. That is not what this bill does.

It creates a set of standards. It says that if a State and local jurisdiction meet those standards, then public sector collective bargaining laws stay in place without exception or change. But it says, in those States with the right to bargain collectively, the right to organize, the right to grieve are not fully recognized, where those States do not come up to standard, then there is a new Federal procedure that would guarantee men and women these rights.

The critics of this legislation say it is a threat to public safety. There is not a shred of evidence that that is the case. Not a shred. There is not a difference in crime rates where there is collective bargaining among public safety professionals. There is not a negative difference in absenteeism or other chain-of-command type of issues.

Frankly, we saw a dramatic example of just how wrong that point of view is. On September the 11th, the police officers and firefighters and other public safety personnel in and around New York City, the Port Authority, the New York City Fire Department, the New York City Police Department, those public safety professionals who responded to this great crisis were all unionized. Many of them were in the middle of a difficult contract process where there was strong disagreement between the City of New York and the union as to what to do next.

Not one of those men or women failed to respond nobly and heroically to the crisis this country faced. Not one. When they went up the stairs in the towers as they were about to crumble, no one talked about whether they were in a union or not. When the New York City Fire Department lost more people in 1 day than it previously had done in months and years before that, no one talked about a contract dispute. These individuals responded nobly and heroically. So the suggestion that there is some corrosion of public safety because of unionization is unsupported by the evidence and just flat-out wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. KILDEE for the strong bipartisan coalition he has built. I would urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' in favor of this bill.

Mr. KELLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my fellow east Tennessean, JIMMY DUNCAN, who is the lead Republican and original cosponsor of this legislation and has been a true champion of this issue.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER), who very rightly claims east Tennessee as a home also. I am pleased to join with him. I want to commend him for his work on this legislation. I also want to especially commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) for their comments about this legislation.

I originally agreed to cosponsor H.R. 980 several years ago, several Congresses ago, at the request of firefighters and police officers from my district. I certainly am not anti-union, nor am I controlled by any union. I strongly believe, though, that no one should be forced to join a union. But I also feel that anyone who chooses to organize or join a labor union should have that right. Employees should be able to make this decision for themselves. In fact, I am a cosponsor, and have been in several Congresses, of H.R. 697, the National Right-to-Work Act. This legislation would prohibit compulsory union membership by applying the right-to-work laws that we have in Tennessee to the entire Nation.

In regard to H.R. 980, I want to emphasize four of the act's main points and then provide some additional details. First, this bill specifically prohibits strikes and lockouts by public safety employees and employers, as has been pointed out by previous speakers.

Second, the bill is not mandatory. It is totally voluntary and, therefore, is a right-to-work bill. Third, it does not federalize or nationalize this aspect of labor relations. The important details would still be governed by State law.

As has been pointed out by some other speakers, several States give their public safety employees more collective bargaining rights than this bill, and it certainly hasn't caused any problems that anyone knows of in those States.

Finally, this bill would simply give firefighters and police officers some, but not all, of the rights enjoyed by other workers. The legislation provides very limited collective bargaining rights and does not give State and local public safety employees the right to strike or numerous other rights that almost all other employees have.

Over the years, Congress has enacted a number of laws granting such rights to other workers and has expanded the scope of collective bargaining laws to govern private sector, nonprofit association, transportation and Federal Government employees.

Since the enactment of the Congressional Accountability Act, State and local public safety employees are the only workers left in America who do not have the right to enter into collective bargaining agreements with their employers. While most States provide collective bargaining rights for these employees, others do not.

When this legislation was being considered originally during the 105th Congress, local firefighters and police officers contacted me directly regarding the bill. Unfortunately, as local elected officials changed, these public safety workers have found that their benefits and wages have sometimes been subject to change, too. These firefighters and police officers feel that this legislation will help them establish consistency in their benefits between the administrations.

Firefighters and police officers have taken an oath to protect public safety. I believe that these individuals should have the opportunity to voice their concerns about issues affecting their livelihood. These brave people risk their lives for public safety every day and should have the same rights as workers in other fields.

Mr. Speaker, let me just mention, as others have, that the Fraternal Order of Police and other police of the National Association of Police Organizations are supporting this bill, and the International Association of Firefighters.

Mr. Speaker, finally, I will close just by emphasizing once again that this legislation would give firefighters and police officers an option to participate in collective bargaining discussions but would not require such action.

I think the good labor unions do not need compulsory unionism agreements. I believe that this is a bill that is encouraging and voluntary, and I urge its support.

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to thank Mr. DUNCAN for his hard work on this bill. He is, as we all know, a study in civility, and civility certainly helps in this House. He also illustrates that we can sit down in a bipartisan way and seek solutions. I thank him for his work on this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON).

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. KILDEE, both for the time and for his leadership in this bipartisan effort. I am so happy as a new Member of Congress to be here to join him and support this legislation today, because it is about fairness for those on the front lines protecting our neighborhoods and communities, our firefighters and law enforcement officers.

This bill is about ensuring these public safety employees, these heroes, have the right to ensure their voices are heard in the workplace. Not only do they deserve this right, we owe it to these public servants who risk their lives and put their safety on the line every day to protect our families and our communities.

Our legislation simply gives them the same rights that so many other workers around this Nation retain. These people who put the public first deserve to be heard on the matters that affect their livelihood.

For our firefighters, police officers, EMTs and other public safety officers, let's rise beyond the words of support, pass this bill, and make it clear that we respect and admire the work and sacrifice of these brave men and women.

Mr. KELLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill. I urge opposition of H.R. 980 because it will force unions' so-called representation on public safety employees.

Labor relations between States and their public employees have historically remained at the State level. H.R. 980 would impose Federal law on States that do not meet forced unionism standards defined in this piece of legislation. Furthermore, the bill fails to ensure a secret ballot election for public employees who would be given the right to unionize under this legislation.

H.R. 980 would deny thousands of police and firemen the freedom to negotiate directly with their employers. Those who attempt to negotiate on their own behalf could face fines and even firings. Unionizing a public sector workforce also requires hiring and training staff to negotiate with unions and administer union contracts which would impose unnecessary financial burdens on taxpayers.

Don't allow the Federal Government to impose costly and inappropriate requirements on State and local governments. State and local governments are capable of managing their own public employees. I urge opposition to H.R. 980, to ensure each State's right to define labor laws for their own public employees.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), my chairman and the chairman of the full Education and Labor Committee.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding. I want to thank Mr. KILDEE for his authorship of this legislation for over, I believe, 12 years now in support of this legislation, and Mr. DUNCAN, his cosponsor, for the same years, to try and provide for the organization of our public safety officers around the country.

I want to thank Mr. KELLER for his work on the subcommittee and Mr. ANDREWS for shepherding this bill through the committee. With the 280 cosponsors of this legislation, which obviously represents very strong bipartisan support, this legislation clearly demonstrates that this Congress is committed to protecting the rights and the livelihoods of our first responders, and this legislation stands in tribute to these dedicated men and women. I am proud that the Education and Labor Committee was able to pass H.R. 980 out of the committee almost unanimously by a vote of 42–1.

Firefighters, police officers, correction officers and emergency medical technicians risk their lives each and every day to protect our lives and this country. H.R. 980 will ensure that all public safety officers have a right to sit down with their employers and bargain over wages and working conditions.

While States and cities and towns have historically managed their own labor relations, approximately 28 States do not fully protect the collective bargaining rights of public safety employees. That is why this legislation is so necessary. This legislation would respect those States that already provide for collective bargaining rights for public safety employees, but it would extend those rights in all other States.

The bill would provide basic labor protections for State and local public safety workers, including the right to join a union, the right to have their union recognized by their employer, the right to bargain collectively over hours, wages, terms and conditions of employment, a mediation or arbitration process for resolving the impasse in negotiations, and enforcement through the courts.

H.R. 980 will give public safety officers a voice in issues like safety on the job and effective delivery of services. It will improve communications and cooperation between rank-and-file public safety employees and their employers, ensuring a more cohesive and coordinated operation.

□ 1100

That's the crux of this legislation. This gives the rights of these negotiations, the rights of these discussions, the rights to have a union, to the very same people that we trust every day to protect our lives, to protect our communities, to protect our country, both before and after a terrorist attack, before and after a criminal act. These are the people that we trust to do this.

This legislation, under the authorship of Mr. KILDEE and Mr. DUNCAN, also suggests that we trust them to have a responsible say in their workplace conditions, in how they carry out their job, to make suggestions, to negotiate with their employers, to more effectively carry out their duties. I think it is a long time coming. I think this legislation and its very broad cosponsorship indicate this could have been done much sooner, but it is going to be done today. It is going to pass the House today. I believe it will pass with large bipartisan support. I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

I also want to say that the fact that this legislation is here today, although 12 years late, is maybe a hallmark of Mr. KILDEE's career, and that is persistence. He doesn't give up on an idea because others disagree. He has pushed for this legislation year in and year out. He was not allowed to have it heard for passage, and this year we were able to accommodate him and Mr. DUNCAN. When we do that, we are also accommodating and supporting our first responders all across the country who need these rights to better do the job that we have handed to them, a very difficult, a very dangerous job. I would hope that the House would pass this legislation overwhelmingly.

Mr. KELLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to my next speaker, what is the time remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER) has 11 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. KELLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Florida for yielding me this time.

There is no one who appreciates firefighters, police and other public safety personnel more than I do. However, I rise in opposition to H.R. 980 because public sector labor relations has never been and should not be an issue with which Congress meddles. Historically, the terms and conditions of employment for all State and local employees has been an issue decided on the State and local level. This is the way it should be.

Some States, such as my home State of North Carolina, have laws banning monopoly bargaining schemes, while others give unions total control over public sector labor relations. Most States fall somewhere in the middle.

But in a move that chips away at States rights, this bill requires all States to set up systems to impose monopoly bargaining on all public safety workers, in effect nullifying the pre-existing laws of 27 States. A move like this is a virtually unprecedented infringement on States rights.

I want to be perfectly clear. Every worker in America, whether public or private, already has the right to form and join a union. That is not the question here. What the unions are asking for is the power to force their so-called ''representation'' on police and firefighters who do not want it. While some States have made what I view as the mistaken decision of giving unions that kind of power, that is their right under our Federal system.

This bill is flawed in that it takes away the right of States to make the decision on their own. At the end of the day, this issue does not belong in our hands. It should be left to the States. And, frankly, it is not Congress's business.

More than half the States in the country have refused to grant union bosses the complete monopoly control over public safety employment mandated by H.R. 980. They have done this not only as a rightful exercise of their States rights, but in the interest of keeping costs low for their taxpayers.

Studies have shown that monopoly bargaining increases costs for taxpayers. Multiplied across dozens of States, this would impose millions of new costs on taxpayers. State and local governments should have jurisdiction over their own employees, not the Federal Government.

The fact that this bill inserts the Federal Government into an issue that has always been one left to the States should give us pause, and it ought to make us wonder why it is being passed under suspension today. Any bill that makes this sort of dramatic change to public policy should be subject to the regular order of full debate and amendments.

Please, I ask my colleagues to join me in protecting the rights of States and vote against H.R. 980 today.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I support the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act providing our first responders with a right that they deserve which has long been withheld, the right of collective bargaining. Many Americans have this right, and our first responders should not be left out.

In professions where working together can mean and does mean the difference between life and death for workers and citizens in our communities, cooperation in a healthy working environment is critical.

In my home State of Vermont, first responders have the right of collective bargaining. We are very proud of them. That right should be extended to their colleagues across the Nation.

Last fall I had an opportunity to participate in firefighting training at the Vermont Fire Academy in Pittsford, Vermont. I suited up in jackets, pants, and oxygen mask. And you know what I learned, the work they do is hard. The work they do is dangerous.

We must make certain that they feel fully entitled to represent themselves at the bargaining table for safe and decent conditions.

Representative KILDEE and Representative DUNCAN, thank you for your leadership in this overdue legislation.

Mr. KELLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Florida for yielding, and when I came to the floor today, I didn't come here to speak; but, you know, my father was a fireman for 26 years for the City of Atlanta. In fact, he died in an alarm. I know what it is like for these firefighters to answer the alarms. He suffered a heart attack while turning off an OS&Y valve in a pit. It was 18 degrees that December morning. I know what it is like for those firefighters. But, you know, my father never belonged to a firefighters union, and that is what this is. This is basically a union bill and payback to the unions.

But, you know, Georgia is a right-to-work State. We have a 10th amendment to our Constitution. I was very disappointed to hear from the chairman that this thing passed out of committee 42–1. That breaks my heart. That really breaks my heart that those Republicans were on that side. I don't know what the majority thinks about the 10th amendment, but I believe very strongly in it. This has something to do with States rights. And I am sorry and I am very disappointed that this House will do this under suspension and there won't be any opportunity for amendments or this thing to be looked at.

I hope that the majority of the Members here will realize what is going on, oppose this suspension and bring it up under regular order.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to respond to our friend from Georgia's comment about compulsory unionism and affirm something my friend from Florida said earlier about compulsory unionism.

Section 8(a)(2) of this bill says that nothing in this act or the regulations issued under this act shall be construed to prevent a State from enforcing a State law which prohibits employers and labor organizations from negotiating provisions in a labor agreement that require union membership or payment of union fees as a condition of employment.

This bill expressly preserves the rights of States to maintain so-called right-to-work laws in their State. I want the record to reflect that point, that the gentleman's concerns about the Georgia Constitution are met in this bill.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I have no further speakers, but I will say this. First of all, this has been a great example of bipartisanship on an issue that very often has divided us. This has brought us together. I think this is a great historical moment. Democrats and Republicans. It was 42–1 in committee, and I think that is something to be said in this body. I think this illustrates that on an issue that very often divides us, labor issues, when it comes to a specific group of these first responders, we can find a way to resolve that division.

Mr. KELLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close. I don't believe we have any other speakers.

Let me just begin by saying what this bill does not do to provide some reassurance to some of my Republican colleagues who may be concerned.

This bill expressly does not allow public safety officers to go on strike. This bill does not preempt State right-to-work laws. This bill does not require compulsory unionism. This bill does not require binding arbitration.

I think we all agree that firefighters and police officers risk their lives every single day and they are entitled to make fair wages and have working conditions that are as safe as possible. This legislation is fair and balanced, and that is why it has received such broad bipartisan support.

On the one hand it does allow firefighters and police officers to collectively bargain for better working conditions and fair wages. On the other hand, it expressly outlaws strikes and does not overturn State right-to-work laws. For those reasons, I urge my colleagues to do what I am about to do and vote ''yes'' on this important bipartisan legislation.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 980, the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act. I commend my friend, Congressman KILDEE for bringing this legislation forward and I am honored to be a cosponsor.

As a former labor organizer, I know firsthand the importance of collective bargaining. I would not be here today as a Member of Congress if it were not for my union. Yet, 21 States do not fully protect the collective bargaining rights of public safety employees.

Firefighters, police officers and emergency medical personnel play a critical role in our Nation's homeland security. They are the first to respond to terrorist attacks, natural disasters and other mass casualty events. These workers deserve the same right to discuss workplace issues with their employer that the Federal Government already grants to most employees. Additionally, rank-and-file input improves communication and cooperation between employees and management for more efficient and coordinated operations that are necessary in our post 9/11 world.

This bill would establish minimum standards that States must meet regarding the process of collective bargaining with public safety employees.

Mr. Speaker, it is vitally important to our national security, public safety, and the rights of our first responders to pass H.R. 980. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, as a cosponsor of the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act, I rise in strong support of the bill.

While most government employees enjoy the right to collectively bargain with their employer, many fire fighters, police officers and emergency medical personnel across the country are denied this right. We must take action to end this injustice.

The Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act would affirm the right of our Nation's State and local public safety officers to bargain collectively and work cooperatively with their employers. This critical legislation would do so by establishing minimum collective bargaining standards for all States. Such standards include: the right to collectively bargain over wages, hours and working conditions, establishment of a dispute resolution mechanism, and the enforcement of contracts through State courts.

Our public safety officers put their lives on the line every day to protect us. Yet, they are denied their right to collectively bargain to better protect themselves and their families. Collective bargaining leads to higher wages, greater access to health care and better retirement benefits. Furthermore, cooperation between public safety employees and employers reduces injuries and fatalities because first responders are more likely to have the safety equipment and resources they need. Studies also show that communities promoting communication between public safety officers and their employers enjoy more efficient and effective delivery of emergency services.

Over the years, we have expanded collective bargaining laws to protect private sector employees, non-profit association employees, transportation workers, and Federal Government employees. One of the few groups of workers not covered by these Federal laws is state and local public safety officers. They work tirelessly to protect us. We must take this opportunity to help protect them.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the Public Employee-Employer Cooperation Act.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor and longtime supporter of H.R. 980, I am pleased this legislation is on the House floor today. This bill will take the important step of guaranteeing firefighters and police officers the right to discuss workplace issues with their employers.

It troubles me to know in many states, public safety employees lack basic collective bargaining rights.

Firefighters and police officers take seriously their oath to protect public safety and, as a result, they do not engage in work stoppages or slowdowns. The absence of collective bargaining denies these workers any opportunity to influence the decisions that affect their livelihoods.

H.R. 980 recognizes public safety officers' unique situation by creating a special collective bargaining right outside the scope of other federal labor law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this legislation.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 980, the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act. I have been a cosponsor of this legislation in every Congress since I was first elected, and I am glad that under Democratic leadership, it has finally come to the floor of the House for a vote.

It is imperative that we do all that we can to assist the police and firefighters that sacrifice so much in order to protect us. This bill requires States to establish a collective bargaining floor to allow police and firefighters the chance to negotiate their labor agreements. Many States already have similar laws on the books, but for those that don't, this is a good starting point. Public safety officers should have just as much of a right as other workers to organize. When they do so, they not only benefit themselves, but also society as a whole.

We are not forcing unionization on States, nor are we doing anything here today that could in any way jeopardize public safety. We are simply allowing those brave men and women who provide for our safety the chance to negotiate a more livable wage, a better pension plan, and expanded health insurance coverage. We owe it to them, and I am glad that this body will finally take up this important bill. I urge passage of H.R. 980.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 980, which is designed to provide police officers, firefighters and other public safety I officers with basic collective bargaining rights, without undermining State authority or existing State laws. I would first like to commend our distinguished colleague, Mr. KILDEE of Michigan, for introducing this important resolution. In light of the post-9/11 era of protecting America from terrorism, in which we are asking our police officers, firefighters, and other public safety officers, to take on more—and more dangerous—responsibilities than they had before, the least we can do is ensure they enjoy the basic right to bargain for better wages and benefits.

State and local public safety officers play an essential role in the efforts of the United States to detect, prevent, and respond to terrorist attacks, and to respond to natural disasters, hazardous materials, and other mass casualty incidents. As the first to arrive on scene, State and local public safety officers must be prepared to protect life and property and to preserve scarce and vital Federal resources, avoid substantial and debilitating interference with interstate and foreign commerce, and to protect the national security of the United States. Public safety employer-employee cooperation is essential in meeting these needs and is, therefore, in the Nation's best interest.

Public safety agencies benefit from constructive relationships with their public safety officers. In fact, local communities also benefit by a more efficient delivery of safety and emergency services. This type of cooperation is promoted by providing public safety employees with the fundamental right to bargain with their employers. Public safety officers deserve the same right to discuss workplace issues with their employer that the Federal Government already grants to most other employees.

The Federal Government needs to encourage conciliation, mediation, and voluntary arbitration to aid and encourage employers and the representatives of their employees to reach and maintain agreements concerning rates of pay, hours, and working conditions; and to make all reasonable efforts through negotiation to settle differences by mutual agreement reached through collective bargaining or by such methods as may be provided for in any applicable agreement for the settlement of disputes.

Mr. Speaker, public sector membership gains are important because they demonstrate workers' willingness and ability to organize under conditions of relative management neutrality and non-interference. If the National Labor Relations Act had covered public safety officers 30 years ago—when health care and nonprofit entities were finally covered—it is likely that public sector unionization in the U.S. today would be at least 80 percent, strikingly similar to Canada, Europe, South Africa, Korea, Japan and every other democracy. Instead, the existence or scope of collective bargaining in half the States is still being determined by State legislators or Governors, who favor either no bargaining at all or limited ''meet and discuss'' arrangements.

If collective bargaining in public employment is indeed a public good, we need to focus more on explaining and defending that process, rather than just highlighting the obstacles that individual unions face while trying to boost their own membership. For example, in France, unions count only 10 percent of the workforce as dues-payers but unions negotiate in nearly all industrial sectors based on longstanding support for collective bargaining. Unions actively compete against each other—both for membership and votes for government-mandated workplace committee members open to all workers in the same workplace or firm. But the country's various labor federations then find ways to engage in common contract campaigns with management or the government; as a result, nearly 90 percent of French workers have collective bargaining agreements.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is very balanced. Given the unique responsibilities of the public safety community, the bill specifically outlaws strikes by firefighters, police officers, and other public safety personnel. The bill also does not interfere with State right-to-work laws; preserves the rights of volunteer firefighters; protects all existing certifications, recognitions, elections and collective bargaining agreements; and exempts all States with a State collective bargaining law for public safety officers equal to or greater than the bill's basic minimum standards.

Promoting collective bargaining is even more critical today, because the Nation is in much worse shape than half a century ago. What is the likelihood that we can address America's safety crisis, the collapse of retirement security, the threat of outsourcing, workplace safety and health hazards, or the growing income inequality without far more workers winning the right to bargain? We know the answer, and it is H.R. 980. For these reasons I strongly urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, throughout my career, I have been a strong supporter of workers' rights to bargain collectively with their employers. And while I believe every worker should have the right to bargain collectively, I think there are few who have more earned that right than our Nation's first responders.

Historically, Congress has given States and localities wide discretion in determining how to negotiate with their public safety employees. The result of this has been a myriad of different rights for different workers depending on where they serve. Some States have very strong rules to protect collective bargaining. Other States have none at all.

Today, the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act gives us an opportunity to ensure that our first responders have a minimum collective bargaining rights no matter what jurisdiction they serve.

This bill would ensure that police officers and firefighters have the basic rights to bargain over wages, hours, and working conditions. The bill also provides for a mediation or arbitration process to resolve disputes.

This legislation strikes the proper balance by prohibiting strikes and lockouts and does not infringe upon existing collective bargaining agreements.

Our Nation's police officers and fire fighters lay their lives on the line every day. At a moment's notice, they are ready to protect us from crime, fire, natural disasters, and, regrettably, from terrorists. And too often they offer their lives in the process.

Though we can never properly repay them for the things they do, this bill will ensure that their collective voice is heard at the bargaining table.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act of 2007. I applaud Mr. KILDEE and Mr. DUNCAN for their impressive work on this bill and I'm proud to be a cosponsor of this important legislation.

As a result of this legislation, public safety officers—police officers, fire fighters, and EMTs—will be able to discuss workplace issues and collectively bargain with their employers.

Public safety officers in Iowa and across our nation regularly put themselves in harms way and risk their lives so that we are safe. It's only right that they have a say in the decisions that affect their lives and their livelihoods. They should be able to negotiate for wages, hours, and safe working conditions.

This legislation has strong bipartisan support. It's the right thing to do and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my concerns about H.R. 980. Unfortunately, this bill, like many under the new majority has come to the House floor under a closed process that prevents Members of Congress from offering any amendment to this bill.

Florida is a right-to-work State, and while the proponents of the legislation argue that this bill does not preempts states rights, the details of the bill simply do not match the rhetoric.

This bill, which is opposed by the National League of Cities, has the effect of forcing thousands of State and local governments to recognize union officials as the exclusive bargaining agents of public-safety officers. Under the process established in this bill—even in right to work states—if union organizers win the representation of 50 percent of workers plus one, they are recognized as the sole bargaining representative of each and every public safety officer. This preempts State laws and strips tens of thousands of police and firemen of their freedom to negotiate directly with their employer. This is tantamount to compulsory unionizing. The bill amounts to an unprecedented federalization of collective bargaining; an area traditionally left to State and local governments. This issue was succinctly stated by R. Theodore Clark who testified on behalf of the National Public Employer Labor Relations Association during the Committee hearing on H.R. 980 when he said:

> [My] opposition to federal collective bargaining legislation such as H.R. 980 is not because I oppose public sector collective bargaining, but rather because of my firm belief that the enactment of a federal collective bargaining law would severely limit the demonstrated innovative and creative abilities of the states and local jurisdictions to deal in a responsible manner with the many complex issues that the public sector collective bargaining poses.

Finally, concerns have been raised that H.R. 980 might endanger public safety by decimating volunteer fire departments that currently protect countless small communities across America. A fact well understood and opposed by small community mayors and volunteer firefighters across the country.

Our local cites and States are the best deciders of how to provide vital services to our citizens. We should not tie their hands by establishing a ''one size fits all'' Federal pattern that cannot hope to account for the unique conditions and structures that our states and localities face. It is for this reason and the decision by the majority leadership to deny the ability of members of Congress to address these shortcomings that I could not vote for final passage of H.R. 980.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 980, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1115

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3043, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 547 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 547

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3043) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of H.R. 3043 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. MATSUI. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MATSUI. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 547 provides for consideration of H.R. 3043, the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Appropriations Act for 2008 under an open rule. Under this rule, all Members of the House are afforded the opportunity to offer any amendment that is germane and otherwise complies with House rules.

Mr. Speaker, the phrase most often associated with this bill has been ''feast or famine.'' For instance, Congress first doubled funding for the National Institutes of Health between 1999 and 2003 and then flat-lined the agency's funds since then. It was actually cut for the first time in history in fiscal year 2006.

In contrast, this year's bill sticks to the principle of sustainable growth in strategic areas: health research, worker safety and education. I would like to applaud Chairman OBEY and Ranking Member WALSH for their hard work in crafting this fair and responsible blueprint for our Nation's future.

Nowhere is this broader strategy of sustainable growth more evident than at the NIH. The underlying legislation provides a modest 2.6 percent increase over last year's level. Such an increase is critical to maintaining America's global leadership in biomedical research. This research will expand the boundaries of human knowledge and keep America at the forefront of the field.

Unfortunately, low or frozen funding levels resulted in almost 1,300 fewer grants from 2003 to 2006. But this year's sustainable increase will allow those grants to expand responsibly.

In particular, I would like to thank the committee for its continued support of the National Children's Study. Its budget within the NIH is very modest, but its impact to children and families will be great. The study will examine environmental effects on childhood development, including autism, asthma and premature birth. For several years, I've been working with the committee and other Members to provide the study with proper support. I'm happy to report that the study has now received widespread and bipartisan support.

I'd also like to highlight the full funding of Ryan White AIDS programs within the bill. Cities and towns all across the country rely on these funds to provide vital health services to individuals with HIV or AIDS. With this funding, the victims of HIV and AIDS will have increased access to medications, primary care and home health care.

In addition to ensuring health care access and advancement, this bill also plans for our children's educational future.

We all realize that the cost of a college education is not getting any cheaper. In fact, it's growing by thousands of dollars a year. So I commend the committee's increase in the maximum Pell Grant by $390 to $4,700. It will permit over 5.5 million students to take advantage of this critical assistance, and it does so without having to reduce other student financial assistance programs, as the administration had proposed.

The underlying legislation also acts responsibly to prepare our Nation's students before they get to college by ensuring better performance at the K–12 grade levels.

Title I grants support schools in high-poverty areas, and they are the engine behind No Child Left Behind. Nonetheless, these grants have been flat-funded or even reduced in the past two school years. This has hindered the ability of title I schools to assist low-performing students. I commend the committee for increasing this fund so that nearly 55,000 title I schools can invest in their young people.

Make no mistake, in a world that increasingly depends on highly skilled employees, this legislation is an investment in the future of our students and in the future competitiveness of this Nation.

In conclusion, I urge all Members to support this rule and the underlying bill. It deals responsibly with the needs of our health care sector, our education system, and the labor market.

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

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

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this proposed rule would provide for consideration of the Labor-Health and Human Services-Education appropriations bill, the seventh out of 12 appropriation bills to be considered by the House this year.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that for the seventh time we are considering this appropriations bill under an open rule that allows every Member of the House the opportunity to come to the floor and to offer his or her amendment to the bill. Except for in the instance earlier this year when the House considered the final fiscal year 2007 spending bill, which allocated $463 billion of taxpayer dollars while denying all Members of the House the opportunity to amend the bill, this rule continues a long-standing tradition of openness on spending bills.

Mr. Speaker, the Labor-Health and Human Services-Education appropriations bill provides over $607 billion to support the Federal Government's role in labor, health and education programs. Of this total, over $455 billion, or 75 percent, is comprised of spending for government programs that grow automatically every year with little congressional review. For the next fiscal year alone, these programs will increase by an estimated $54 billion, nearly 12 percent, which I might add, Mr. Speaker, is three or four times the rate of inflation.

Without question, these programs pose the largest threat to our long-term economic health because they essentially run on autopilot with little accountability to the taxpayers writing the checks. If we want to get spending under control, it is vital that we take a hard look at these programs sooner rather than later.

The remaining money in this appropriations bill is set by Congress each

year. For the last fiscal year, $144 billion was provided to support the Federal Government's role in labor, health and education programs, but for the upcoming fiscal year, the underlying bill provides for $151 billion, an increase of $7 billion.

Mr. Speaker, while I support some of the increases in the bill, such as an increased funding for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, I do have concerns with the overall increased spending level in this difficult budget year. I believe that Congress must always stop and remember that we are spending the American taxpayers' money when considering appropriations bills. Each time a decision is made to spend more money, taxpayers face a higher tax bill or the deficit faces an increase in leaving our children and grandchildren to foot the bill. Therefore, we must take a balanced approach that provides for the general welfare of our Nation while reducing the deficit.

It's important that taxpayers are aware that under the Democrat majority's budget plan, each taxpayer faces an average $3,000 increase in their Federal tax bill in order to pay for the Democrats' spending spree over the next 5 years, as reflected in their budget.

Throwing money at all of our Nation's problems will not make them go away. The American people expect more of Congress. They expect us to tackle the difficult issues, make tough decisions and lower the deficit through fiscal restraint.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to make a few comments before I yield to the next speaker.

I'd like to say that the President's budget would have cut education programs, health care programs, energy assistance for seniors, avian flu by some $7.6 billion below last year after adjusted for inflation. This bill rejects most of those arbitrary cuts. As a result, some Members have criticized it.

But the bill only increases these funds by a modest 3 percent after adjusting for inflation and population growth. This increase puts the bill a full $2.9 billion below its funding level in 2005. It is interesting logic that when you're spending less than you did 2 years ago, it's out-of-control spending.

The subcommittee's ranking member testified to the Rules Committee last night that he would have written a very similar bill as Mr. OBEY did had he been in the chairman's seat. And most of the amendments offered in committee were by the minority seeking to increase various funding levels in the bill.

This bill funds our Nation's health care, education and worker protection programs in a responsible, sustainable manner.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I thank the gentlewoman from California.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress faces the challenge of acting on the direction of the American people, as expressed in the vote of November 2006, and that is to change the direction of this country and to restore a domestic agenda that serves all Americans.

We began, and again on a bipartisan basis, with 100 hours, raising the minimum wage, reversing wasteful subsidies to the big oil companies, and instead funding renewable energy, requiring price negotiations so our taxpayers didn't get ripped off in prescription drug prices, making college more affordable.

□ 1130

These measures are a down payment, but just a beginning. Today, the House takes up the eighth of 12 appropriation bills. This bill, under the leadership of Mr. OBEY, more than anything else, is going to put a stamp on a new direction that this Congress is moving in.

It's a direction that says all Americans have to be included, not just the wealthy, not just those who can afford corporate lobbyists. All Americans have a right to affordable education, to quality health care, to safe working conditions and to a financially secure retirement. Getting from here to there is a challenge, but this is the road that this bill takes us on.

Let me mention just four different areas. First, the legislation restores $7.6 billion in funding to vital programs that have been cut by the administration. At the same time, it saves $1.1 billion from lower priority programs. There is a commitment here to fiscal responsibility.

We must invest in America's future generations, and the bill does that.

Second, again, I will just mention a few things that are important to us in Vermont. We have had unfunded mandates. Special Ed, No Child Left Behind are the poster childs of that. This bill increases funding for No Child Left Behind by $8.6 billion over fiscal year 2007.

This bill invests in vital rural health care programs, something that we in Vermont are very familiar with, by increasing funding by $307 million. That provides real services to real people with real health care problems. This bill increases funding for the vital Low Income Heating Assistance Program. That was cut in the administration proposal by $379 million, or 17.5 percent, below last year's level. That's simply not sustainable. That's going to inflict real harm on people who have no ability to control the price of home heating oil.

This bill is taking us further on the road of having a Congress who is committed to the needs of all Americans.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 547 is an open rule providing for consideration of the fiscal year 2008 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations bill.

The underlying legislation puts many of this Nation's most critical agencies on a responsible and sustainable funding path. Chairman OBEY and Ranking Member WALSH should be commended. As the Rules Committee heard in their testimony yesterday, they worked in a cooperative manner without partisan rancor to balance many competing needs funded through this bill.

This bill strengthens our families and prepares our workforce for the challenges that lay ahead. For instance, in just 7 years, nearly half of all the Nation's job growth will be concentrated in occupations requiring a college degree. This bill helps prepare our young people for this new world by increasing funding for students at K–12 or college level. In particular, it rejects an administration proposal to freeze Pell Grants. Instead, this legislation increases Pell Grants by $390 to $4,700 on top of a $260 increase provided in 2007 continuing appropriations resolution. These efforts will make great strides in making college more affordable.

The legislation also maintains our Nation's leadership in health care research by lifting a 2-year freeze on the average cost of new research grants to NIH, and it provides a responsible increase in employment, training and worker protection programs. These are just some of the ways in which the underlying legislation provides millions of Americans with access to affordable health care, a decent education, and strong worker protection.

I urge all my colleagues to support this open rule and the underlying bill.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the previous question and on the rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

MOTION TO GO TO CONFERENCE ON H.R. 1, IMPROVING AMERICA'S SECURITY ACT OF 2007

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXII and by direction of the Committee on Homeland Security, I move to take from the Speaker's table the

bill (H.R. 1) to provide for the implementation of the recommendations of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Blackburn moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 1 be instructed to agree to section 1455 of the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

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

The motion to instruct would require the Secretary to deny a Transportation Worker Identification Credential, a TWIC, to any applicant who has been convicted of certain crimes.

This card is the access card to our Nation's critical and sensitive port and maritime facilities. We have over 750,000 workers who access our ports daily. TWIC was created to ensure that they are all screened and that they pose no threat of terrorism.

Now, our motion would specify that individuals convicted of certain crimes, such as treason, espionage, sedition or murder, would be permanently disqualified from receiving a TWIC card. This would further specify interim disqualifying crimes, such as smuggling, arson, kidnapping or robbery, that would disqualify an individual within a certain timeframe of conviction.

This provision provides the right balance between ensuring that our ports are safe while ensuring that we have the workers we need to get the job done in a timely manner.

We all agree that protecting our ports is one of the most critical duties that we have. All the guns, all the gates, all the guards in the world, every bit of that is useless if we give an individual a TWIC card to walk right past them.

This would ensure that the screening of these individuals is thorough, and that it is complete. While some may argue that this will unnecessarily disqualify too many individuals, we have already provided for an appeal and waiver process elsewhere to ensure that individuals can apply for a TWIC despite their past history.

This section that we are offering today in this motion to instruct passed the Senate 94–2. Our motion to instruct would accede to the language in the Senate provision.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the House has passed its own language as it relates to the issuance of the TWIC cards. We have negotiated for the last 2 months with our Senate colleagues and, for the most part, we have a bipartisan agreement on the issuance of the transportation security cards to convicted felons.

That agreement talks about many of the things my colleague referenced in the report. It talks about treason, it talks about sedition, it talks about espionage, all those things.

Therefore, I think carrying it to the level that my colleague would want to carry it is not in the spirit of the conference report that we are negotiating with our colleagues in the Senate.

It is bipartisan. We have been meeting for 2 months to craft a language. It's good language.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the body's attention, we had last week on July 10, a front page article in The Hill talking about this.

The concerns with this clause, I know that this program, TSA is going to roll this TWIC card program out on September 1. I would hope that our security is of such importance to us that we would not weaken this program.

We know that the security of our ports is important. We want to make certain that the workers that we are sending in to these ports have gone through the appropriate clearances. We know that these are critical and sensitive areas. Why would we want to give a card to someone who has been convicted of crimes such as treason, espionage, sedition or murder?

I do not think that the American people want to see those individuals inspecting the cargo that's coming into these ports. We hear so much about security and food security, the issues that surround that. We are hearing about the security of human trafficking that is going through our ports. For goodness sakes, we want to be certain that the people that are walking into those ports to work every day are not convicted of these serious crimes.

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

□ 1145

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. I now yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Let me thank the distinguished chairman of the full committee, and to the Speaker, my good friend from Tennessee, we are here on this floor for a very serious deliberation.

Over the last 10 days we have heard a number of responses from the administration; and I have often said that if and when, if and when there was a turn of events that would generate a horrific and terrorist act against this Nation, it is the Members of the United States Congress and committees with names like Homeland Security and Defense that would have to be called to the carpet.

None of us, none of us, Mr. Speaker, have any desire to be on the list of those who are derelict in their duties. In fact, Chairman THOMPSON has been enormously zealous in constant oversight of the Department of Homeland Security, constant briefings, and I am reminded of one that occurred in the last 10 days where the term ''gut feeling'' was introduced to us. Out of that particular briefing, many of us tightened our belts and began to reflect on the oversight hearings and the legislative initiatives that will respond and have responded to that gut reaction. So the dilemma, or the discussion today, as we bring up the 9/11 bill, may I remind my colleagues, is about terrorism. It is about the thought and the fear that Americans have of who lives amongst us.

The TWIC card, as Transportation Security Administration is about to issue forward with regulations, is one of the elements to define who is in this country that would want to do us harm. Let me say this again, Mr. Speaker. It is a card to define who wants to harm us.

As the chairwoman of the Transportation Security Subcommittee, Critical Infrastructure, we live every day with those individuals who are receiving identification, those at airports. We have done oversight about employees' ingress and egress, about the back side of the airport. We are well aware, my colleague Representative SANCHEZ, LORETTA SANCHEZ and her committee, well aware of the massiveness of the Nation's ports. We could give you a list of times that we have been to look at the intimacies of the port. But what my good friend is speaking about clearly has no direct relationship to ensuring America's security and releasing or eliminating the fear that Americans have about the next-door terrorist cell. This amendment, this motion to instruct is not constructive. For what it says is that age-long workers, union workers who through an early lifetime had the ups and downs of a criminal record, have now been cast as terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in opening the doors to criminal elements. I don't disrespect the fact that we are concerned about murderers and others who have done dastardly deeds. But what you are talking about is taking an age-old seasoned port worker, union member, and eliminate their livelihood by projecting onto them the question of whether or not they are in line to perpetrate a terrorist act.

The TWIC card is an identification document to ensure that those who are in possession of that card have no connection to any elements of terrorism. It is to safeguard the American public.

It is not, it is not, if you will, the sledgehammer on hardworking, taxpaying Americans. And let me be very clear: The TWIC card is no wimp. There is a serious review process that goes forward that takes into account everyone's record and includes any elements that would lead us to believe that this person might perpetrate a terrorist act.

I respect the gentlelady from Tennessee because I know that she is, as we all are, warriors against terrorism, and this Congress has to be united on this factor. I would raise the question, however, as to whether or not these modifications of a TWIC card that has already been vetted directed only at eliminating, firing, and terminating lifelong employees with strong records that have shown no inclination and no past history to terrorist acts is the appropriate direction to take.

I hope that we can join in this body, as Chairman THOMPSON has encouraged us as members of his committee, to focus in a bipartisan way on solutions to major problems: Critical infrastructure, nuclear and biological possibilities, the reconstruction of FEMA, the interests in protecting our ports and borders north and south. This is how, an intelligence response that shows who is here as it relates to terrorist cells and who is here to do damage. These are the key elements, along with the 9/11 bill, that lay down the underpinnings, the framework of the survival of this Nation. Let us not fall upon divisiveness in the redesign of a card that has been fully vetted in its structure, that will do what it is intended to do, which is to weed out the terrorists and to allow hardworking Americans to continue to work and provide for their families. They, too, are patriots. And we as patriots and lovers of this country must stand united together in doing the right thing to secure America.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi spoke of the compromise language, and the compromise language does not give our TSA the tool in its toolbox that it needs. Indeed, the compromise language would weaken that tool that they need in that toolbox to be certain that they are giving Americans the certainty that they want to view our Nation's ports security with. They want to know that certainly the people that are coming into those ports have our Nation's best interests at heart. And I fully believe that they do not want individuals who are convicted of these crimes of treason, espionage, sedition, murder and, further, interim disqualifying crimes such as smuggling, arson, kidnapping or robbery to be in there watching the cargo and the transportation that comes into our ports and maritime facilities. Certainly, this is a regulation that TSA uses now with our truck drivers who are moving hazardous material. So the compromise language would take a tool out of that toolbox that TSA uses to give Americans the certainty that they are doing their best.

Now, with respect to the question from the gentlelady from Texas, and I appreciate the hard work that she does at the Homeland Security Committee, but this would provide only a 7-year lookback, and I think that that is important to note in that screening process. But at the same time, Mr. Speaker, we want to be certain that screening is thorough, that it is complete, and that there is certainty given to the American public.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, for the record, I would like to say to my colleague from Tennessee, this bipartisan agreement was worked out in the spirit of making sure that those individuals who work in various capacities in high-risk areas, that they are, in fact, not security risks. So what we have done, we have taken espionage, we have taken sedition, we have taken treason, any felony crime of terrorism, crime involving a transportation security incident, improper transportation of hazardous material, unlawful possession, use, sale, distribution, manufacture, purchase, receipt, transfer, shipping, transporting, import, export, storage of or dealing with an explosive device, we have gone into great detail in defining those disqualifying areas.

In addition to that, we have laid out interim disqualifying criminal offenses that go toward unlawful possession, sale, manufacture, purchase, distribution of firearms; extortion, bribery, smuggling, immigration violations; distribution, possession with intent to distribute or importation of controlled substance; arson, kidnapping, rape, assault with intent to kill; robbery, conspiracy, fraudulent entry into a seaport, a violation of the Racketeering Influence and Corrupt Organization Act. Mr. Speaker, we have gone in great detail to list as many offenses as we could.

Now, from what I understand from the gentlelady's motion that we are debating, the only issue is that you don't want the Secretary of Homeland Security to have the ability to look at these things and say whether or not they should be modified. Now, if we are wrong in our interpretation, that is fine, but as we look upon what you have before us today, that is the only thing.

If we can't trust the people who run the Department to make certain administrative decisions, then who can we trust? And it is in this spirit that we left that particular modification language there for the Secretary to look at any unforeseen crime that may or may not have been excluded in this disqualifying criminal offense.

So clearly, Mr. Speaker, it was a bipartisan effort, and we wish to offer it.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman was just making his point, and in part of that he is right, but the important part of this is that what we have to do is be certain that a Secretary doesn't delete these provisions. And if you are going to give them that flexibility and if they delete it, then you have that hole that is there. So, because of that, we need it in statute to be sure that it is not altered.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Our Secretary of Homeland Security is appointed by the President. I would think that he would appoint the best qualified person, someone who would have the interests of this country at heart every second that he or she may be in that position. So to take the ability of an individual who is running a department from making certain decisions is not in our best interests.

We should not micromanage the Department of Homeland Security. We should let the Secretary of Homeland Security run the Department. He should have the administrative authority to do it. This would not be in the best interests of us. We do not do this in other secretarial departments.

And so, again, Mr. Speaker, in the interest of identifying crimes that are disqualifying, but notwithstanding the fact that the Secretary should have some discretion over running his or her Department regardless of what that Department may be, this is the bipartisan spirit in the conference that we reached.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

□ 1200

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I speak on this motion with the greatest respect for the gentlelady from Tennessee. But I would say that in my prior life, before coming to the Congress I was a prosecuting attorney, and I was responsible for sending a lot of people to prison.

I also had a responsibility to go down and visit people that I'd sent to prison. And I remember the first visit that I made down to one of the prisons in Ohio, and there's these trustees outside the prison gates with white stripes on the side, and they were given trusted positions within the prison.

And I said, who are the trustees? How do you get to be qualified to be a trustee? And they said, well, they're murderers. And I said, what do you mean, they're murderers? They said, they're murderers.

What we find is that in the crime of murder, most murders in this country are committed in crimes of passion, a husband murders a wife, a wife murders a husband, a boyfriend and so forth and so on. But they are also the least likely people to ever commit crime again.

And what concerns me about the requirement of receding to the Senate provision in this is that it ignores the opportunity for rehabilitation. It ignores the opportunity that people

make mistakes, and they're not a threat to national security, and they can be good productive people. They can work in our ports.

And I am concerned that murder is one of the automatic disqualifiers. I am also concerned that the other list of crimes that have waiting periods of 5 to 7 years, they have nothing to do, in my mind, with terrorism or port security.

And I am all for a system where the Secretary or even in law the Congress of the United States says, you know what, if you committed a crime of violence we're going to take an extra look at you; but to be automatically disqualified, either forever or for a considerable period of time, I think disturbs me.

I intend to vote against the motion. I respect the gentlelady's opinion and why she's brought this motion, but sadly, I can't agree with it.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, you know, the appeals and waivers process was put in place for a reason, and that is why it is there, and that's why you've got the look-back provision and why it is stated as such.

Again, I will reemphasize the point. We don't want to do something that is going to weaken a tool that is in the TSA toolbox for being certain that we have the necessary security at our ports; that we know who is there and we know the reasons they are there, that we know that they have the appropriate clearances for being there.

And with all due respect to the chairman and the chairwoman who have worked on this legislation, our wording here, acceding to the language that passed over in the Senate, 94–2, would be certain that we have in statute something that is going to give our citizens the security that we have done our job.

It is the responsibility of this body to be certain that we have this national security interest at heart for the people of this good Nation, and certainly this language is one step in so doing.

And at this time, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Mississippi has no further speakers and is ready to yield back, then I will do so. But I want to be certain I have the right to close on this.

Mr. Speaker, I will reserve at this point.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have one additional speaker. I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the chairman. To my good friend from Tennessee, let us be very clear that homeland security is a bipartisan issue.

What the chairman has indicated is that we are yielding to the Secretary of Homeland Security for a slight opportunity to be able to modify, if you will, in his reasoned judgment, that deals with securing America. We are not ignoring sedition and treason. I want my colleagues to know that.

But the individuals that will now be subjected to the TWIC card, which costs 137 dollars and 700,000 people will be processed the first year, and 1.5 million persons the second year, these are our neighbors, individuals who have been working in this capacity who have nothing in their background that would suggest that they are terrorists.

The gentlelady's motion would literally shut down America's ports. Commerce would come to a standstill. As my good friend from Ohio has said, people rehabilitate. Give the Secretary the opportunity to use his judgment and to use his discretion to be able to secure America on the real causes of sedition and treason.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Suspension of the rules on H.R. 980, by the yeas and nays;

Adoption of House Resolution 547, de novo;

Motion to instruct on H.R. 1, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYER-EMPLOYEE COOPERATION ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 980, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 980, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 314, nays 97, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 633]

YEAS—314

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Camp (MI)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Graves
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Heller
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt

Stark
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tauscher
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—97

Aderholt
Akin
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Boozman
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Calvert
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Conaway
Culberson
Deal (GA)
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hensarling
Herger
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Lamborn
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Putnam
Radanovich
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Sali
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Tanner
Taylor
Thornberry
Walberg
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wolf

NOT VOTING—20

Alexander
Brady (TX)
Brown, Corrine
Carson
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Edwards
Gohmert
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hinojosa
Johnson (IL)
Kucinich
Lewis (GA)
McCaul (TX)
Ortiz
Payne
Price (GA)
Sestak
Tancredo

□ 1232

Messrs. SALI, BOOZMAN, ISSA, PITTS, PICKERING, WICKER, PETERSON of Pennsylvania and MELANCON changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. WILSON of South Carolina, HASTERT, BURTON of Indiana and COLE of Oklahoma changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SESTAK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 633, I was detained while picking up my 6-year-old daughter who had become ill. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3043, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts). The unfinished business is the question on adoption of House Resolution 547 which the Chair will put de novo.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 178, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 634]

YEAS—232

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—178

Aderholt
Akin
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—21

Alexander
Brady (TX)
Brown, Corrine
Carson
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Edwards
Gohmert
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hinojosa
Johnson (IL)
Kucinich
Lewis (GA)
McCaul (TX)
Ortiz
Payne
Peterson (PA)
Price (GA)
Tancredo
Wilson (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1240

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 635, my vote was mistakenly recorded as "yea"; however, I intended to vote "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I missed rollcall Nos. 633 and 634 since I was at Walter Reed Army Hospital visiting injured troops. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 633 and 634 I was unavoidably detain and not able to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on 633 and "no" on 634.

MOTION TO GO TO CONFERENCE ON H.R. 1, IMPROVING AMERICA'S SECURITY ACT OF 2007

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on H.R. 1 offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 354, nays 66, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 635]

YEAS—354

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Cleaver
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Israel
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Pastor
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—66

Abercrombie
Baldwin
Berman
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carson
Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Delahunt
Farr
Filner
Frank (MA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kingston
LaTourette
Lee
Markey
McDermott
McGovern
Melancon
Miller, George
Moore (WI)
Murtha
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Price (NC)
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Solis
Stark
Thompson (MS)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Wexler
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—11

Alexander
Brown, Corrine
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Hinojosa
Johnson (IL)
Kucinich
Lewis (GA)
McKeon
Payne
Tancredo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1256

Mr. CUMMINGS changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 17, 2007, I was unable to vote on rollcall Nos. 634 and 635. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on both.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately this morning I was unable to cast my votes on H.R. 980, H. Res. 547, and the Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 1 and wish the RECORD to reflect my intentions had I been able to vote.

Had I been present for rollcall No. 633 on suspending the rules and passing H.R. 980, the Public Safety Employer-Employee Cooperation Act, I would have voted "yea."

Had I been present for rollcall No. 634 on passing H. Res. 547, the rule providing for consideration of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations for FY 2008, I would have voted "nay."

Had I been present for rollcall No. 635 on the Motion to Instruct Conferees to H.R. 1, the Implementing the 9/11 Commission Recommendations Act, I would have voted "yea."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Conferees on H.R. 1 will be named later.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2641, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 2641 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 481, notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no further amendment to the bill may be offered except:

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

An amendment by Mr. ROTHMAN limiting funds for the Green Maintenance Building in North Bergen, New Jersey;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting Army Corps of Engineers construction funding for the South Central Pennsylvania project;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Coastal Wind Ohio project;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Green Maintenance Building in North Bergen, New Jersey;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the National Center for Manufacturing Science in Michigan;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the University of North Alabama Green Campus Initiative;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Center for Instrumented Critical Infrastructure in Pennsylvania;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Alliance for NanoHealth in Texas;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Notre Dame Innovation Park in Indiana;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the ACE Program at Maricopa Community Colleges in Arizona;

An amendment by Mr. HENSARLING limiting funds for the South Carolina HBCU Science and Technology initiative in South Carolina;

An amendment by Mr. HENSARLING limiting funds for the Environmental Science Center, University of Dubuque, Iowa;

An amendment by Mr. HENSARLING limiting funds for the Emmanuel College Center for Science Partnership in Massachusetts;

An amendment by Mr. HENSARLING limiting funds for Roosevelt University Biology Laboratory Equipment in Illinois;

An amendment by Mr. HENSARLING limiting funds for Nanosys, Inc.;

An amendment by Mr. CAMPBELL of California limiting funds for projects requested by Members of Congress and disclosed pursuant to the rules of the House, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes; and

An amendment or amendments by Mr. VISCLOSKY regarding funding levels.

Each such amendment may be offered only by the Member named in this request or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment, except that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and its Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of debate; and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

Except as otherwise specified, each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. An amendment shall be considered to fit the description stated in this request if it addresses in whole or in part the object described.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VISCLOSKY. 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 during further consideration of H.R. 2641.

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

There was no objection.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 481 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. 2641.

□ 1300

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. 2641) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with Mr. TIERNEY (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 20, 2007, the amendment by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 40, line 18.

No further amendment to the bill may be offered except those specified in the previous order of the House of today, which is at the desk.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROTHMAN

Mr. ROTHMAN. 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. ROTHMAN:

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

SEC. 503. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the Green Maintenance Building in North Bergen, New Jersey.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent to claim the 5 minutes in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, even though I am not opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will not take my full 5 minutes. This amendment strikes an earmark for a project requested by myself and Congressman SIRES who together represent the town of North Bergen, New Jersey.

The funds allocated in this bill would have gone towards the construction of a new public works building in North Bergen, New Jersey, that would have repaired and maintained all of the vehicles for that municipality, as well as all of the fire trucks for the surrounding five towns of Weehawken, Guttenberg, West New York and Union City.

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

Mr. ROTHMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, we would be happy to accept the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I want to set the stage for what is occurring on the House floor at this point in time because it is my privilege to submit to the House for final passage H.R. 2641, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2008, with its supplemental report.

On July 10, the Appropriations Committee approved the supplemental report unanimously by voice vote. As I have said before, this is a good bill and it merits the support of the entire House.

I would emphasize that the money spent in this bill, whether enumerated originally by the administration or by the Congress, are investments, investments in our national security, investments in our energy security, and investments in the health and safety of our citizens. They are investments to

create a climate and to build the infrastructure that encourages the development of new, good-paying jobs in our country.

To the extent we have made changes in the administration's priority, the changes have been to enhance the effectiveness of the programs in this bill and to complement them.

I would like to give two examples. All one needs to do is look at the West Sacramento Flood Control Project as proof that we are dealing with fundamental issues, like ensuring people and their families' lives are secure and their homes and their businesses are protected from devastating floods. In Tennessee, the Center Hill Dam is another project that Congress has funded to control flood waters and generate clean, safe and efficient hydroelectric power.

There are also examples of administration funding requests that originated in Congress years ago. For fiscal year 2006, Congress designated funds to support activities at the supervisory control and data acquisition test facilities at the Idaho National Laboratory. This system has proven itself so useful in helping to improve the reliability and robustness of the electric power grid that for fiscal year 2008 the administration has included the project as part of its project request. If nothing else, this shows how the executive and legislative branches can work together to fund important projects for the Nation, regardless of who initiated support for the idea.

Mr. Chairman, as we consider today's supplemental report to the Energy and Water Appropriations bill, I urge my colleagues to keep these factors in mind. The specific projects enumerated in this report serve a purpose: To improve the quality of life for our citizenry and to make advances on key priorities facing our Nation.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fair and bipartisan manner in which the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) as our chairman has used to put this supplemental report together. I fully support the list of congressionally directed projects that it contains. I encourage Members to support these projects and to vote for final passage of the underlying Energy and Water bill.

When we first brought this bill to the floor roughly a month ago, I expressed my concern about the absence of detailed project guidance on how to spend this much money. The supplemental report that is before the committee today resolves that concern.

Chairman VISCLOSKY and I, and our respective staffs, engaged in a lengthy bipartisan effort to sort through the thousands of earmark requests that we received. We screened the large number of requests to select the projects that had the most merit and were the best fit for inclusion in the Energy and Water bill. We have complied fully with Chairman OBEY's direction to reduce the value of our energy earmarks by one-half compared to the amount we funded in fiscal year 2006.

The Corps of Engineers faces an enormous backlog of work, somewhere between $12 billion and $60 billion, and that is before the pending WRDA bill adds another $13 billion of unfunded requirements. There is a significant need for additional funding for water resources infrastructure, above and beyond what the administration requested. This supplement provides another $770 million for specific Corps water projects. Within a total appropriation of $5.58 billion for the Corps, less than 14 percent is dedicated to congressionally directed projects. Every one of those projects is already authorized, and every one has been reviewed by the Corps to be sure they have the capability to execute it. Until we make some progress with the backlog of ongoing work, we continue the past practice of not funding any Corps new starts.

On the Department of Energy side, the committee recommended $246.5 million for 263 specific projects, which represents a 50 percent reduction from the amount of DOE earmarks contained in our fiscal year 2006 bill. Many of these projects are intended to demonstrate alternative energy technologies. It is important to note that we are spending billions of dollars on DOE's energy security mission, which includes the research, development, demonstration and deployment of advanced energy technologies. If this research is to be worth the investment, and if this research is to improve our energy security by reducing our dependence on imported oil and reducing the environmental impact of burning fossil fuels, then these technologies must ultimately be adopted by the private sector.

Therefore, a significant number of our Department of Energy earmarks are "green" buildings to demonstrate alternative energy technologies. It is important that we show the American people that there are alternatives to burning fossil fuels for power generation, for transportation, and for heating and cooling, so that builders and consumers know these alternatives are available and affordable. We intentionally put these technology demonstrations in high-traffic settings designed to get a lot of public exposure, such as museums, educational institutions, and community buildings, in order to maximize the value of these demonstrations.

We have a constitutional responsibility to appropriate funds for the Federal agencies. That means we do not simply rubber-stamp the administration's project requests, but rather, we put our own mark on the annual agency budgets. That is what this supplement represents. I support this supplement to our bill, and I encourage the other Members to do so as well.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. 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. FLAKE:

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

SEC. 503. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the Achieving a College Education Program at Maricopa Community Colleges.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION IN FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for "Atomic Energy Defense Activities—National Nuclear Security Administration—Office of the Administrator" is hereby reduced by $1,000,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, 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 prohibit a million dollars, and reduce the cost of the bill by a consistent amount, from being used to fund an earmark for the ACE Program at the Maricopa County Community Colleges.

While I am often criticized for meddling in the congressional districts of other Members in my attempts to make Federal spending on earmarks transparent, that accusation would be unfounded with this amendment.

As the saying goes, "all politics is local," and this amendment makes that a truism, with a portion of Maricopa County within the boundaries of the district I represent.

As I am sure the sponsor of this earmark will be proud to tell you, the Achieving a College Education program was started in 1988 at one of the community colleges in the Maricopa system, and has spread to all 10 of its institutions.

According to the ACE Program Web site, the program is a partnership between community colleges and local high schools that was designed to reduce dropouts among at-risk high school students and transition them to community colleges and university studies.

It would be foolish and not truthful for me to stand here and say the program is not making a valuable contribution to Maricopa County. However, the criteria for receiving another Federal handout of $1 million cannot and should not rest simply on whether a program is doing valuable things.

I am certain that at many, if not all, of the hundreds upon hundreds of community colleges across the country there are important programs that are making valuable contributions to their communities. Surely the taxpayer shouldn't have to fund all of those programs. So how do we choose? How does Congress decide which important, valuable programs get funded with taxpayer dollars and which do not?

The willingness of Members of Congress to give Federal handouts to a select few has led to more than $5 billion in earmarks in this appropriations bill, a bill that is more than $1 billion over the President's request and has garnered a veto threat because of it.

In addition, this earmark is focused on education and raises the question of

why it is being funded out of the account of the Office of the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration. It is my understanding that Federal funding for the ACE Program came through the Department of Housing and Urban Development in previous years.

Other earmarks in the account of the Office of the Administrator for educational programs seem to highlight math and science education. While components of the ACE Program highlight math, science, technology or engineering, this appears to be only one facet of the program and not the sole purpose at all. In fact, other components also appear to highlight health services, business industry technology, community service, adult education, personal finance, and other areas.

I would submit to my colleagues again that if simply having a program that makes a valuable contribution were enough to warrant being awarded millions of dollars, the Treasury would soon be empty.

Further, I would submit that an earmark of this variety is misplaced in the Energy and Water appropriations bill, and should at the very least be considered in the upcoming Labor, Health and Human Services appropriations bill.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, as the sponsor of this program, as my colleague from Arizona has told you, it has been in existence for a number of years and has in the past received Federal funding. With the Federal funding, we have expanded this program to all of the community colleges in the Maricopa County Community College System.

My colleague asked the question why in DOE and why the Office of the Administrator? Four or 5 years ago, the Department of Energy, through the Secretary then, it was decided that the Department of Energy was going to get involved in the educational programs dealing with historically black colleges and also with Spanish-serving institutions. It was to ensure that there would be a stream of people into math and science programs.

As you know, our President has a number of times emphasized and has began initiatives through the Department of Energy that would help recruit students into the math and science classes. So when the Secretary of Energy made that commitment, knowing that that program was available to colleges and universities, a presentation was made to the Department of Energy whether this program, ACE, would be one that they had an interest in. In one of the hearings ACE was brought up.

So the Department of Energy with the board and administrators of the Maricopa County Community College System began negotiating and set up this program. The intent is to serve minority students that are enrolled in schools throughout Maricopa county, to assist them in a path of math and science. It is in cooperation with the community colleges, because MCCG is encouraging these students to go through the community college system and then take them to the university.

As this program was presented to me 3 years ago by the Maricopa County community colleges and was presented to the Department of Energy, because of the many success stories and it is a program that needs to continue.

The reason it is in DOE is because that is where the program is and that is where the moneys are allocated for this type of program.

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman who just spoke, Mr. PASTOR, and I know of his concern for education and his commitment there.

The point I would make again is there are many valuable programs out there. There are thousands and thousands of community colleges out there. I would think that we simply have to stop saying all right, we are going to fund this one or we are going to fund that one without some kind of criteria that should be set by somebody else other than Members of Congress because we are in a position where it happens politically.

Now that is not to say that decisions by Federal agencies aren't political. They often are. That's the responsibility of oversight, for us to step in and say you ought to have this criteria or this merit-based selection process or this competitive grant process.

But for us to say we don't like the way the Federal agencies do it so we are going to do it ourselves, I would think is not the wisest course. With that, I would urge support of the amendment. We simply can't fund all of the programs, the good programs that are out there, and maintain any type of position here in Congress of being equal or being good stewards of the taxpayer dollars. With that, I would urge support of the amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR).

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, the program in the Department of Energy is geared to get minority students into a pathway of math and science. I did not write the program. All I did was act as a facilitator between the community college system and the Department of Energy. There is an agreement. The agreement was signed 3 years ago between the Department of Energy and the Maricopa County community colleges. In that agreement, DOE has filled out the requirements of the program that the community colleges have had to adhere to, it is an agreement between the Department of Energy and the community college system.

□ 1315

All I did was facilitated between the community college and the Department of Energy, and I would ask my colleagues to reject this amendment, because the program assists minority students to achieve a college education. It's an initiative that the President has put forward, and the Department of Energy has taken on the initiative. This agreement is between the community college system and the Department of Energy.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. 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. FLAKE:

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

SEC. 503. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the Alliance for NanoHealth.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION IN FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''Department of Energy—Science'' is hereby reduced by $750,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, 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 prohibit $750,000, and reduce the cost of the bill by a consistent amount, from being used to fund an earmark for the Alliance for NanoHealth, or ANH.

The ANH is comprised of seven universities and scientific institutions headquartered in Houston, Texas.

ANH's mission is to collectively bridge the disciplines to develop nanotechnology-based solutions to unresolved problems in medicine.

This earmark, according to the certification letters submitted by the sponsor, will be used for electron microscopy equipment, a high-resolution CCD camera, freezing apparatuses as well, for training and for upgrades for shared equipment purchases.

In 2004, the Federal Government provided $2.4 million in start-up funding for the alliance through an earmark in the Department of Defense appropriations bill. In fiscal year 2005, the Alliance for NanoHealth received a total of $7.4 million in Federal earmarks.

In addition to the earmark in this bill, ANH is scheduled to receive another $1 million for fiscal year 2008 in the Commerce, Justice and Science appropriations bill.

There is a competitive and transparent process for awarding Federal research contracts and Federal grants, but this is not it.

Let me be clear. I congratulate the alliance for its work and for its contributions to society. I believe that we, as lawmakers, should do everything we can to encourage more private sector research and development activity, but there is a troubling and growing tendency to replace private sector activity with governmental intervention. This earmark bears witness to that.

Just look at the 2006 endowment ratings for the university members of the Alliance for NanoHealth: Number 4 on the list, University of Texas system, $13.2 billion; number 10 on the list, Texas A&M, $5.6 billion; number 55, Baylor Medical School, $1.1 billion; and the list goes on.

Let us not allow the Federal Government to push private donors aside and remove the incentive for them to contribute in this or any other endeavor.

And with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOBSON. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have some kind of discussion on this, but apparently not. Apparently the sponsor of the earmark doesn't want to speak to it or we're just going to leave it.

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, as I said, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

We used a bipartisan process, and I was very involved in strict adherence to the applicable House rules and a thorough examination of Member requests. This process resulted in funding recommendations for the projects that we considered the most meritorious. This project that this amendment attacks is a legitimate use of Federal funds to further the development of the Department of Energy's mission.

In closing, I believe this amendment has no basis and should be defeated, and I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, there is another disturbing trend here. It's often thought that if there is a bipartisan basis for the offering of these earmarks that it's okay. As long as 60 percent goes to the majority, 40 percent to the minority, then it's okay whatever you fund. That shouldn't be the basis on which we distribute taxpayer dollars at all.

In this case, for science grants there is a competitive and transparent process at the Federal agency level. If we're not happy with that process, we should intervene in that process, change it, mandate a more competitive process or a change in the process, instead of supplanting that process with one of our own that is far less competitive, that really is just political, because it pits one Member against another or one committee against another.

That's not how money should be awarded. If the agencies have too much money, we should cut it. If they don't have enough, we should add more. We should stipulate, we should mandate, we should have oversight of those agencies. But basically saying we're just going to have our own process because we don't like what they're doing over there is not the right way to go.

And I would say that this earmark is a good example of that, and for that reason, I offer the amendment and would urge its adoption.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The Acting 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 Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

SEC. 503. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for Concurrent Technology Corporation.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION IN FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''Department of Energy—Fossil Energy Research and Development'' is hereby reduced by $1,000,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I was tempted just not to offer any other amendments and just offer this one because this one is important for everyone to focus on because it points at problems not just with the earmark itself but with the process that we have in the House. And I would submit that we are not following that process as we should.

This amendment would strike funding for the Center for Instrumented Critical Infrastructure. The center is to receive $1 million in taxpayer funding in this bill.

When searching on the Web, my staff and I were unable to find the center's Web site. I'm not sure whether the center currently exists or whether this earmark creates the center. I would appreciate if the sponsor of this earmark would clear that up.

All the bill says is that it funds $1 million for the Center for Instrumented Critical Infrastructure in Pennsylvania. However, when you look at the certification letter that each Member now, according to our earmark rule, is required to submit, you see that the earmark is actually going to the Concurrent Technology Corporation based in Jonestown, Pennsylvania. This is a leading earmark recipient in multiple appropriation bills over the years.

Currently in this year, I believe in the Intelligence authorization bill this same group, Concurrent Technology, received two other earmarks. Why isn't that in the earmark itself in what we were handed? We only learned that through the certification letter. Is the earmark to go to the Instrumented Critical Infrastructure Center or to Concurrent Technology? I would love to have that clarified here.

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

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I take it the sponsor of this earmark is not here to talk about it, but if I could ask the chairman where the earmark is supposed to go. Does the earmark go to this Center for Instrumented Critical Infrastructure or to Concurrent Technology?

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

Mr. FLAKE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I'm sorry, I did not hear the gentleman's question.

Mr. FLAKE. I'm wondering, in the report that accompanied the bill, it mentioned that the earmark was to go to the Center for Instrumented Critical Infrastructure, but the certification letter says that it's going to go to that but the earmark should actually go to Concurrent Technology Corporation. Which is it?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. It is my understanding that it will go to the Center for Instrumented Critical Infrastructure.

Mr. FLAKE. Does that center currently exist?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. At this time, I do not know, but if it does not exist, the moneys could not go to it.

Mr. FLAKE. We were told in this process early on by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that a different process was needed, that the earmarks should be added later in conference and not now because the Appropriations Committee simply couldn't vet or scrub these earmarks well enough. I would submit that this is a perfect example of that.

We've had another example. One earmark was actually withdrawn, one on the list that I was to offer, because it hadn't been adequately scrubbed. I would submit that this one should be as well, when the chairman of the relevant subcommittee can't tell us if this

center even exists. We don't know if it even exists, if it's created by this earmark.

Concurrent Technology has been the recipient of millions upon millions of dollars over the years. The executives in Concurrent Technology contribute handsomely to Members of Congress. So it receives a lot of earmarks. It seems to be an earmark incubator of some type, an earmark that begets more earmarks.

And yet we have the report that comes with the bill that doesn't even mention Concurrent Technology. It just mentions this center as if it already existed. We don't even know if it does. We can't even find any information on it, and apparently we can't even get that information from the Appropriations Committee.

So I would submit that this is what this process is about. This is why we come to the floor. This is why we invite the sponsor of the earmark to defend the earmark. But I would say again, does this center exist? Do we even know if it exists? How do we know if it's a good center or a bad center? Is this Concurrent Technology, which already receives millions and millions of dollars in other bills, worthy of another earmark to create another center?

These are the questions that we have to ask.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I would continue to reserve my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I guess I will finish off. I will call for a vote on this one, but I think it's important when Members are voting on this earmark and whether to retain it that we have to know what we know and know what we don't know.

We don't know if this center even exists. We are appropriating money for a center where the Appropriations Committee that has a responsibility to vet this earmark can't even tell us here if this even exists. We don't know that. We're voting on an earmark where in the report it says it goes to the center, but here in the certification letter it mentions Concurrent Technology, a private company. Which is it?

If we don't know these facts, we don't know what's going on here, I would say the thing to do is to vote this down, to actually vote for the amendment and wait until the Appropriations Committee actually has time to scrub and to vet these earmarks a little more carefully.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

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

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

Mr. FLAKE. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Illinois) having assumed the chair, Mr. TIERNEY, 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. 2641) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1, IMPROVING AMERICA'S SECURITY ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on Homeland Security, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, Ms. Loretta Sanchez of California, Mr. Dicks, Ms. Harman, Mrs. Lowey, Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas, Mrs. Christensen, Messrs. Etheridge, Langevin, Cuellar, Al Green of Texas, Perlmutter, King of New York, Smith of Texas, Souder, Tom Davis of Virginia, Daniel E. Lungren of California, Rogers of Alabama, McCaul of Texas, Dent, and Ms. Ginny Brown-Waite of Florida.

From the Committee on Armed Services, for consideration of secs. 1202, 1211, 1221, 1232, 1233, and 1241 of the House bill, and section 703 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. Skelton, Spratt, and Saxton.

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of Title I, Title II, secs. 743 and 901 of the House bill, and Title III, secs. 1002, 1481, 1482, 1484, and Title XVII of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. Dingell, Markey, and Barton of Texas.

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of secs. 601, 1202, 1211, 1221, 1222, 1232, 1233, 1241, 1302, 1311, 1312, 1322, 1323, 1331–1333, 1412, 1414, 1422, 1431, and 1441–1443 of the House bill, and secs. 502, 1301, Title XVIII, secs. 1911–1913, and 1951 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. Lantos, Ackerman, and Ms. Ros-Lehtinen.

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of secs. 406, 501, 601, 702, and Title VIII of the House bill, and secs. 123, 501–503, 601–603, 1002, and 1432 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. Conyers, Ms. Zoe Lofgren of California, and Mr. Sensenbrenner.

From the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for consideration of sec. 408 and subtitle A of title VIII of the House bill, and secs. 114, 601, 602, 903, 904, 1203, 1205, and 1601 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. Waxman, Clay, and Issa.

From the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for consideration of secs. 601, 712, 723, 732, 733, 741, 742, and subtitle A of title VIII of the House bill, and secs. 111–113, 121, 122, 131, 502, 601, 602, 703, 1201–1203, 1205, 1206, and 1606 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. Reyes, Cramer, and Hoekstra.

From the Committee on Science and Technology, for consideration of secs. 703, 1301, 1464, 1467, and 1507 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. Gordon of Tennessee, Wu, and Gingrey.

From the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of Titles I–III, sec. 1002, and Title XI of the House bill, and secs. 202, 301, Title IV, secs. 801–803, 807, 901, 1001, 1002, 1101–1103, 1422–1424, 1426, 1427, 1429, 1430, 1433, 1436–1438, 1441, 1443, 1444, 1446, 1449, 1464, 1473, 1503, and 1605 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. Oberstar, DeFazio, and Mica.

For consideration of Title II of the House bill, and Title III and subtitle C of title XIV of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. Larson of Connecticut.

There was no objection.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 481 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. 2641.

□ 1335

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. 2641) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with Mr. TIERNEY (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

Mr. HENSARLING. 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. 35 offered by Mr. HENSARLING:

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

None of the funds in this Act may be used for the South Carolina HBCU Science and Technology initiative (SC).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, this particular amendment would save the taxpayers $1.5 billion. This would

strike the funding for the South Carolina HBCU Science and Technology initiative.

Let me say at the outset that I have no doubt that good use could be made of these funds by this institution in South Carolina. Let me also stipulate I have no doubt that the gentleman from South Carolina, who has offered this earmark, knows far more about the good work they do at this institution than do I.

But I do believe that it is critical that every single penny of Federal spending be put in the context of its impact, not only on the taxpayer, but of future generations. I think if you are going to lead, you have to lead by example.

Now, I wish we had the opportunity to come to the floor each and every day and debate what will happen to future generations if we don't alter the spending patterns that we presently have in Congress today.

In fact, the chairman of the Federal Reserve has recently spoken, ''Without early and meaningful action to address the rapid growth of entitlements, the U.S. economy could be seriously weakened with future generations bearing much of the cost.''

A report from the Government Accountability Office, the rising cost of government entitlements are a fiscal cancer that threatens catastrophic consequences for our country and could bankrupt America.

I know that principally our spending patterns are driven by entitlement spending. But as the late Everett Dirksen once said, $1 billion here, $1 billion, we are starting to talk about real money. By one estimation, we already have 10,000 Federal programs spread across 600 agencies, and it seems like week in, week out, we just add, add to those particular programs.

The question I have here today again is when we look at this one expenditure, and, yes, earmarks are a small part of Federal spending, but I believe that they are a large portion of the culture of Federal spending. I am not religiously opposed to earmarks.

Again, maybe good things can be done with this money. But looking at the fact that the Federal budget is going way beyond the ability of the family budget to pay for it, at what point do we say that maybe, maybe the Federal taxpayer shouldn't be asked to spend money that goes to, I believe in this case, a private college.

Again, as I understand it, the funding would be used for math and science research at the respective institutions.

Well, we have got some of these institutions in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas. I am sure they could use the money at Eastfield College. I am sure they could use the money at Trinity Valley Community College. I am sure my alma mater, Texas A&M University, which is not in my district, could use this money as well.

But out of the hundreds of thousands of institutions of higher learning, why are we deciding that the taxpayer is supposed to fund this one? Is there any good purpose, any good program, any good project in America that shouldn't receive a Federal subsidy? That's kind of the question that we have here today.

When I see a group of earmarks that are going to institutions in Members' districts, and I reflect upon the fact that we are now on a collision course to either double taxes on the next generation, or, for all intents and purposes, have no Federal Government, save Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security, we have got to start saving the pennies. When we start saving the pennies, eventually, the dollars will take care of themselves.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment and claim the time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I would be happy to yield time to my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank my chairman for giving me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

In fiscal year 2003, while I was a member of the Energy and Water Subcommittee, I requested an analysis of the Department of Energy funding, which had been historically received by historically black colleges and universities.

When I met with the subcommittee staff to go over these numbers, I think it is fair to say that we were all shocked. At that time, Mr. HOBSON was chair of this subcommittee, and he summoned me to his office, and we sat down to discuss these numbers.

What we found was that over the prior 5 years funding to these institutions by the Department of Energy had been somewhere around 6.8 percent of all of their funding to colleges and universities across the country. In that 5-year period, that number had dropped to 2.8 percent, and we decided that it would be good to take a look at whether or not this could be reversed. I want you to just think about that.

Less than 3 percent of the funding by the Department of Energy was going to these institutions, yet over 25 percent of all black students in higher education were attending these institutions.

Now, my congressional district has seven, I would say to the gentleman from Texas, seven historical black colleges and universities, and he seemed to be discussing this amendment as if it were one.

I would also say to the gentleman that in my congressional district, you will find the University of South Carolina, The Citadel, the College of Charleston, Columbia College, Francis Marion University. And I would say that as far as the University of South Carolina is concerned, in this same subcommittee, you will see some earmarks, if you please, I call it targeted funding, to that institution. Yet I would ask the gentleman why has he singled out the HBCUs with no attention given to the University of South Carolina.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the gentleman from Texas that this funding, $10.5 million, is a very small investment for these students. I applaud the gentleman's desire to be a good steward of the taxpayers' money. But our suggestion is that his focus is misguided. This small investment will pay huge dividends to the constituents I represent, and I rise in the strongest objection to this amendment.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I would just add, there is a number of amendments I have, not just simply those in the gentleman's district, I suppose I could be here all day speaking about them.

I might also add that I am pleased to have a historically black college in my district, Jarvis Christian College in Wood County, Texas. Last I looked they don't have any money in this particular bill.

But the question again is, if we are going to help people with education, doubling taxes on the American families, which the budget resolution has done, which this bill is a part of, is no way to help an education.

I would urge adoption of this amendment.

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1345

Mr. HOBSON. Let me say this: as the gentleman spoke, this came about when I was chairman of the committee. We relooked at what we were doing for HBCU. I happen to have two in my district. These institutions are generally underfunded and generally don't have the ability to put the emphasis on science and technologies that many of us believe these students should have. This is an effort by the committee to direct that money so we can increase taxes and can increase funding to the Federal Government and to other agencies by getting these people involved in science and technology. So I wholeheartedly support the committee's recommendation and would urge to vote down the amendment.

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

Mr. HENSARLING. 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. 36 offered by Mr. HENSARLING:

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

None of the funds in this Act may be used for the Environmental Science Center, University of Dubuque, IA.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to continue on somewhat with some of the themes that were touched upon in the last amendment. But before I do, I do want to say a few words about the overall bill.

I do want to say that I think a lot of good work was done by the committee, by the chairman, by our ranking member. It is my understanding that the dollar value of the earmarks has declined substantially from the last bill. I am going to say that I view that as progress. But I also want to say that when we are approaching as a Nation a very nasty fiscal fork in the road, and in this institution unfortunately there is a nasty habit of just kicking that can down the road as I mix my metaphors; but, again, don't take my word for it, look at the analysis of the Congressional Budget Office, look at the analysis of the General Accountability Office, look at the Office of Management and Budget.

Just dealing with the government that we have today, if Congress just disappeared and created no new government, we are going to reach this fiscal fork in the road in the next generation, where we are either going to have to double taxes on our children and grandchildren, or for all intents and purposes there will be no Federal Government save Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

It is not my analysis. Look at the analysis of these other bodies. And so I believe again that, unfortunately, although earmarks today are a small portion of the Federal budget, they are a large portion of the culture of Federal spending.

Another reservation I have is my fear that too often they teach people and teach institutions to become dependent upon the Federal Government. I come from Dallas, Texas, and a part of the Fifth Congressional District takes in the eastern part of the City of Dallas. I was dealing not long ago, taking a tour with one of the very revered and esteemed medical institutions within the City of Dallas that said that for years and years and years they were always happy to competitively bid through the NIH process or other processes for their research grant money. But they have awakened to the dawn of a new day now to where so many of their other competing medical education, medical research institutions were receiving their Federal funding via the earmark track. And so finally, after all these years, they broke down and invested in a Federal lobbyist. Now, they were happy with a competitive system, but they have realized that, unfortunately, that is increasingly not where this Congress is headed.

And so I believe that that is a bad thing, again, to try to somehow move away from what should be a more competitive process into one that does something else. Now, again, I think there is a lot of wonderful earmarks here. I have no doubt about it. But, unfortunately, more often than not we see earmarks representing a victory of the special interests over the national interests, a victory of seniority over merit, and too often a victory of secrecy over transparency.

I am glad that the Democrat leadership recently reversed themselves to allow the transparency that we see today, and I believe that that is a good thing. But two things we have to remember as we hand out money to one specific educational institution, and in this particular case the Environmental Science Center at the University of Dubuque. Maybe good things can be done with that money, but how about the good things that the taxpayers who fund this, how about the good things they could have done?

I recently received some correspondence from a lady in my district, Joyce of Tennessee Colony, Texas: ''Dear Congressman, please do what you can to stop the wasteful spending. I am retired; I am disabled. I am raising three grandchildren and now one great grandchild. I sometimes cannot afford my own medicine. It takes everything I have to get us from month to month. Gas has become a problem. I can't go to church at the end of the month because I don't have gas to get to town.''

So here we are, Mr. Chairman, in an energy and water bill, and we are harming the energy program of American families to put energy earmarks in this bill.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply make the observation that for collectively the decisions made for congressional changes in the administration's request represent about 1 percent of the total funding for the Department of Energy in this bill, and they were very thoughtfully made. And whether they be, in this instance, in Dubuque, Iowa, or any other community around the United States, it is certainly the committee's position and belief that those investments are urged for the greater good of everyone living in this country, and that is certainly to the advantage of every taxpayer in the United States of America.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose the amendment by the gentleman from Texas, which would prohibit funding in the Energy and Water Appropriations bill for the new Environmental Science Center at the University of Dubuque in Iowa. When opened, this Center will provide State, regional, and national benefit through educating undergraduate and graduate level students in the environmental sciences, and helping to create the next generation of science professionals.

The need for greater science education has received a lot of attention in recent years, and is an integral component of ensuring America's global competitiveness. As a Member of the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math Caucus, I believe strongly in the need for investment in science education, and I recognize the direct role that the Environmental Science Center plays in keeping America competitive.

The University of Dubuque has offered an interdisciplinary major in Environmental Science since 1980, with many graduates currently working in scientific fields. The environmental science program at the university is unique because of its hands-on focus and strict scientific training. In nearly every course, a field laboratory provides direct, applied experiences for all types of students. Furthermore, University of Dubuque's tri-state location affords students the opportunity to work with three State natural resource agencies—Iowa, Illinois, and Wisconsin. Even as an undergraduate, students are able to receive a regionally based scientific education.

The new Environmental Science Center will allow the university to expand on its proven record of educating national scientific leaders. The Center will specialize in hands-on, applied learning for current science teachers, environmental agency personnel, undergraduate environmental science majors, and education majors to teach the next generation of American scientists. A failure to fund the Environmental Science Center would be a step backward for America's scientific proficiency.

This funding is consistent with the President's goal to, ''encourage innovation throughout our economy and to give our Nation's children a firm grounding in math and science.'' [President George W. Bush, State of the Union Address, February 1, 2006] America needs facilities like the University of Dubuque's Environmental Science Center to provide a grounding in science, and help move America forward.

I strongly oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, because it will set America back in terms of global competitiveness and will endanger programs that will educate the next generation and allow them to

compete with the likes of China, Europe, Japan, and Asia.

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

Mr. HENSARLING. 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. 37 offered by Mr. HENSARLING:

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

None of the funds in this Act may be used for the Emmanuel College Center for Science Partnership, MA.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, in specific, this amendment would strike the earmark that would fund the computer and science equipment at Emmanuel College Center for Science Partnership.

Again, following up on some of the debate in the earlier amendments, I simply question why, at a time when our Nation continues to face great fiscal challenges in the future, that although these individual earmarks may be small amounts, I almost feel like the story of the three bears, whether the porridge is too hot or too cold. You come to debate spending on the floor, and sometimes people will tell you, well, that program is so big it is a sacred cow, you can't touch it. And then other times, Mr. Chairman, you hear, well, we are dealing with a very small amount of money here, so why are we bothering with that? You almost believe it is part of the NIMBY syndrome, the ''Not in My Back Yard.''

And, again, I will say I am sure the sponsor of this earmark knows far more about it than I do, knows far more about the educational institutional, and I have no doubt that good things could be done with that money. But that is not really the relevant question. The relevant question ought to be, number one, is this something the Federal Government ought to be doing in the first place, given all the other challenges and needs that we have.

Second of all, is this a priority? Is this a priority? Because we know now that as, recently, Congress voted to increase the debt ceiling, continues to raid the Social Security fund. Is it worth taking money out of the Social Security trust fund to fund this particular earmark or any other particular earmark? And that is what Members have to decide.

And although I am sure the sponsor of the earmark can make a very good defense and tell us all the wonderful good ways that this money will be used, and I am sure he will tell us that he knows his district better than anybody else, I stipulate that. I stipulate that. But, Mr. Chairman, I think I know my district, the Fifth Congressional District of Texas, better than anybody else in this institution; and I am fearful that every time the people of the Fifth Congressional District are called upon to fund somebody else's earmark somewhere else across the Nation, because, again, as we are trying to fund Federal energy and water programs, we are taking away from family energy and water programs, including in many of those in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas.

Recently, I heard from Ken of Mabank, Texas. He was concerned about this single largest tax increase in the history that was passed as part of the Democrat budget. And as you spend more money, you have to tax more money. And so we know that the average American family in the next 5 years is going to be faced with an extra tax burden of about $3,000 a year, and part of it pays for earmarks like these. I heard from Ken in Mabank, and he said: ''Dear Congressman, any increase in taxes will hurt my family budget and cause us to cut back in other key areas. The rising gas prices have already made us cut back on spending. Why does the Federal Government continue to have an open checkbook based on the backs of the taxpayer, me?''

Well, I get letters like these every day, Mr. Chairman. And, again, we have to be cognizant as these so-called investments are made in Washington, we are taking away the ability of families including those in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas to make their investments in energy, their investments in water. And, again, I have no doubt that the sponsor of this amendment believes that good things can be done with the money, but is every good thing in America due to receive a Federal subsidy? Shall we start to subsidize Girl Scout cookies? How about cut flowers in everybody's home? My children, who are age 3 and 5, are just now learning to swim. Maybe we should subsidize swimming pools in every community across America. Where does it all end? Where does the madness stop?

This kind of spending fuels the single largest tax increase in history and threatens, threatens, to double taxes on our children. I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. At this point I would yield time to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO).

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, several questions I guess I heard. Number one, about earmarks in general. I respect that. That is a legitimate debate to have. I personally thought I wasn't elected just to rubber-stamp the President's desires or his administration's; I was elected to also exercise judgment, judgment on behalf of my constituents and judgment on behalf of the people of America. One of the things I think is important is to educate the children of America.

This particular earmark goes to a private college that has entered into a private, private partnership with Merck to build a new science lab, to educate the children from, I would dare say, some of them might be from the Fifth District of Texas. This is a private university run by nuns. And, by the way, if Sister Janet ever called you and asked you for a favor, you would do it, too, if you had any brains, because I wouldn't say no to Sister Janet. So I don't know exactly what the debate is. This particular one is to educate our own children in an merging field of biotechnology and other sciences.

Now, I know that some of the people that don't like this amendment also don't want us to bring people from overseas for those jobs. I question, where would they come from? Who will we hire? If we don't want people coming from overseas, which is a fair comment, and we don't want to educate our own children, where is the next generation of scientists coming from if we don't help?

Mr. Chairman, this is just another ploy to get some kind of philosophical opportunity to make marks. It doesn't help the country, it doesn't address the specific item at hand, it is just a way to make some television time; and I urge this amendment be defeated.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, now, I have never met Sister Janet, but I have heard from Melanie in Chandler, who said: ''If I have to pay more taxes, then I can't afford to go to school.'' I have heard from Rose in Garland who says: ''I am a divorced mother with a child in college. An increase in taxes would wipe out hope of the first college graduate in the family.''

Fueling earmarks like these take away from family education programs, Mr. Chairman. And that is why I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO).

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, I understand that people don't like to pay taxes. Neither do I, unless those taxes are used for wise and important purposes. And if the gentleman is so concerned about every taxpayer that doesn't want to pay taxes, then why are we still in Iraq?

The amounts of money you are concerned with you said is a very small

amount of money. And it is, to you. It is not to Sister Janet and to the students at Emmanuel College. And if you are that concerned with it, all you have to do is just shut down Iraq for less than 30 seconds and you would have this money available to us. So I don't believe that the real concern is tax money, because if it were, we wouldn't be having this debate. We would be having a debate on another matter that is much more financially irresponsible.

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

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

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

Mr. HENSARLING. 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 Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

Mr. HENSARLING. 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. 38 offered by Mr. HENSARLING:

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

None of the funds in this Act may be used for Roosevelt University Biology Laboratory Equipment (IL).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike the earmark used to fund the equipping of two laboratories, creating 48 state-of-the-art work stations at Roosevelt University Biology Laboratory.

Again, Mr. Chairman, there are so many great colleges, so many great universities across our Nation. How do we get into the business of subsidizing some and not subsidizing others?

□ 1400

Again, there are many worthy colleges in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas, Jarvis Christian College, Eastfield College, Trinity Valley Community College, and a much greater list beyond that. And so somehow, the students who attend those colleges in the Fifth District of Texas, either they or their peers are being asked to take money that would be destined for their education programs and send them somewhere else, in this case Illinois, to fund somebody else's education, somebody else's research.

I again stipulate that I have no doubt that good things could be done with this money. I don't know what. I'm sure the gentleman who sponsored the earmark would be happy to let us know the good things that can be done with this money.

But too often, Mr. Chairman, we seem to forget whose money it is in the first place. And so that's why I bring these letters, this correspondence from people from the Fifth Congressional District of Texas, because we should never ever forget that as we're plussing up some Federal program, be it in energy or water or education, you're taking away from some family's program where they're trying to fund their energy, their water, their education.

And again, Mr. Chairman, I just don't know how people can be aware of the fact that this Nation is on a collision course for a fiscal calamity. Just the government we have today threatens to double taxes on the American people. Now, a lot of those people today can't vote. Some of those people aren't even born yet. But we know it's going to happen.

Go to the Congressional Budget Office. Go to the Office of Management and Budget. Listen to the Federal Reserve Chairman. Let me quote from some other sources. I quoted earlier from Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke, that without early and meaningful action, the U.S. economy could be seriously weakened, with future generations bearing much of the cost.

CBO, either a substantial reduction in the growth of spending, a significant increase in tax revenues relative to the size of the economy, or some combination will be necessary to promote the Nation's long-term fiscal stability.

A famous economist, Robert Samuelson, the rising cost of government retirement programs, mainly Social Security and Medicare, increase taxes or budget deficits so much that they could reduce economic growth and this could trigger an economic and political death spiral.

And so what I hear from too many of my colleagues is, well, this is just a few dollars in my particular district. Well, the challenge is great. The challenge is great. We must lead by example, and by leading by example, we shouldn't be bringing a bill to the floor, number one, that has a 4.3 percent increase over last year, 3.7 percent over the administration's request, and quite often they request too much, that I believe contains 5.6 billion in earmarks. Where does it all stop?

Is this truly a Federal priority? Or should the priority be to assure that we leave the next generation with greater freedom and greater opportunity?

That fight starts today. I know too often the focus in the Nation's capital is on the next election and not the next generation. We ought to put it on the next generation because if we don't there'll be no money for them to fund their education programs. There'll be no money at all. And so we need to start today, and in this area of earmarking funds to these private educational institutions is a good start.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. At this point I would like to recognize my colleague from the State of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding.

I've listened rather intently all afternoon to the gentleman from Texas and his amendments. I've tried to find some logic. I've tried to find some validity. I've tried to find some argument. And, you know, for the sake of me, I have not been able to find any.

You can talk to any educators in America, and they will talk about the great need that exists for science teachers. You can talk to any medical schools, anybody really interested in health care, and they will talk about the need for scientists. You can talk to researchers. You can talk to people who try and keep us competitive with other nations, and they will talk about the great need that exists. You can talk to school districts who are importing science teachers from other countries because we don't have an adequate supply here in the United States of America.

Then I hear the gentleman say, let's not fund these institutions. Let's not give the Roosevelt University, named for one of our great Presidents, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, which provides opportunities for young people who would never, ever get the chance to go to college, to learn science.

Well, I can tell you that I still have not been able to find the logic of the gentleman's argument, other than to say let's not have earmarks. I'm sure that Jarvis Christian could use whatever resources that it could get, and of course it would have them if its Representative had requested and tried to get what they need.

So I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment, urge that it be voted down, down, down, as far down as it can get, and that we provide the opportunity for young people in America to fulfill the dream of a college education, a chance to earn a living, raise their families, make America the Nation that it has not been.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the $700,000 from the Department of Energy—Science account for biology laboratory equipment for Roosevelt University in Chicago, IL. Roosevelt University seeks equipment assistance for its biology laboratory which supports student and faculty work in cell and molecular biology. These subjects are integral to majors in the sciences, pre-health career programs, and science education. This request would equip 2 laboratories, creating 48 state-of-the-art workstations and provide equipment for institutions advancing science and science education. The total cost of the project is

$6,000,000. Roosevelt University has partnered with the State of Illinois and local university funds are available for this project. This laboratory also supports the summer career pathways biotechnology program with Chicago Public Schools.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure we're having a debate over how much money we're going to spend over education. We are certainly having a debate over who should do that particular spending.

I'm sorry that the gentleman from Illinois doesn't see the logic of American families who are working hard trying to save money, trying to put their children through college, and yet he has an earmark that is helping being funded by the largest tax increase in American history.

I heard from Joy in Dallas, ''I could not pay for a semester of college for my daughter if I had to send $2,200 more dollars to the government.'' We can ask her about the logic of the gentleman's earmark.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment from the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

Mr. HENSARLING. 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. 39 offered by Mr. HENSARLING:

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

None of the funds in this Act may be used for Nanosys, Inc.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, this particular amendment would strike the earmark for Nanosys, Inc. The funding would have been used to develop a fuel cell membrane electrode assembly to enable the production of lightweight fuel cells suitable for automotive applications and portable electronic devices.

Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that that is a very worthy expenditure of funds. I, myself, prior to coming to Congress, used to be an officer in what most typically know is a green energy company.

The issues surrounding fuel cells, the issues surrounding making energy more environmentally friendly, making America more energy independent are very, very important issues. But I wonder, I wonder about the wisdom, about earmarking funds to a specific, which I assume to be, for profit company, a private company. Otherwise why are they called Nanosys, Inc.?

There are hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of thousands of companies across America, all trying to do good things, trying to feed our people, educate our people, clothe our people, heat their homes in the winter, cool them in the summer, help them with transportation. What isn't a priority here?

And so now we give all the indication that, instead of having a company come and compete in some process, some kind of competitive bidding process, instead we have an earmark to a private company. Why is their fuel cell technology so superior to somebody else's?

Back when I was affiliated with Green Mountain Energy of Austin, Texas, they were doing a lot of good things to produce power from wind energy and solar energy and biomass. Perhaps I should encourage some of my former colleagues of that particular private company to, instead of competing in the halls and competing in the marketplace, to come compete in the halls of Congress for an earmark.

Now, again, this Nation desperately needs advances in fuel cell technology, but to start handing money, through earmarks, to individual companies, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe is the way to go.

And furthermore, once again we face such fiscal challenges. Our energy challenge, our educational challenge are not the only challenges we face. We face a great fiscal challenge. To paraphrase the Controller General Walker, he has said, we are on the verge, in America, of being the first generation in our Nation's history to leave the next generation with a lower standard of living.

□ 1415

It has never been done in the history of America. And we will do that if we don't stop the ways that we spend the people's money.

So, again, I am faced with a bill here that spends 4.3 percent more than last year. I am faced with an earmark that is part of that process. I am looking at a Democrat budget plan, Mr. Chairman, that will be $21 billion over the President's request. I am looking at a Democrat budget resolution that is going to impose the single largest tax increase in America's history not only on the good people of the Fifth Congressional District of Texas but everybody. So, again, the relevant question is not can good things be done with the money. I am sure Nanosys can do a lot of good things with the earmark that they will mostly likely receive. But it is coming out of American families. It is coming out of their energy budget. It is coming out of their education budget. If we don't fund it through that, if we pass more debt on to our children, then what are they facing? They are facing doubling of their taxes and our generation passing on to them a lower standard of living. And, Mr. Chairman, I simply do not wish to be a part of that.

So I urge adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment and claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for the very good work that he has done, all the members of the committee, because I know that you have to make difficult choices.

I am pleased to speak on the floor today about this investment in new technologies. As so many Members of the House know, I have the privilege of representing a congressional district that is the home of innovation and technology, high technology, biotechnology in our Nation. So perhaps the gentleman from Texas should come to visit because he would quickly come to respect what our country has come to rely on as well as our national economy.

I believe that this is a small but very important investment, and it will make vehicles more fuel efficient. I think this is not only a value of the people of my congressional district but of the entire Nation.

Our country today is paying too high a price for not being fuel efficient, not being energy efficient; and to add insult to injury, we are depending upon our opponents and in some cases our enemies to supply us. That is a policy that I believe is on its head, and so I was pleased to request of the committee that we make an investment in this technology.

Now, what does it do? It develops a new type of cost-effective, energy-efficient fuel cell for automobiles. Now, fuel cells, we know that they can dramatically improve mileage per gallon, but the downside is that they require platinum, and platinum is expensive and it is in short supply. But it is needed because it is the catalyst for these fuel cells.

This particular investment actually will go a long way to dramatically increase the surface area of the platinum in a fuel cell. In other words, it will bring down the price. In fact, this project that I have requested funding for promises to produce a one-third cut in the overall cost of the fuel cell.

Now, we are respected around the world for the investments that we have made collectively, public and private, in new technologies. It seems to me that this is cutting edge, that it is smart, and that it is wise.

I would like to make two broader observations. Number one, when I listen to the gentleman from Texas, he registers the complaints from his constituents.

You know what? You don't have a corner on the market of constituents that care about how we spend money. Of course these things should be scrutinized. I welcome it.

But when there is an overall public good here where all of the American people win, not just my constituents from the 14th District in California or the gentleman's district in Texas but all Americans, that is a good investment.

Number two, my constituents pay taxes, just like yours. And guess what? Californians don't get back everything that they send here. So are some things appropriate, good investments? We have to scrutinize that. But mine pay a fair share just as everyone else's do. As a matter of fact, California sends more than it gets back, which includes my constituents.

And I would like to add a final point, and my mother used to say this, and now her words, I think, are truer than ever: ''There are some that know the cost of everything but value nothing.''

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I have listened intently to the gentlewoman's debate. I would simply say that it sounds too good to be true. If the company is on the cusp of making such wonderful breakthroughs, I just wonder, then, why taxpayer funds are needed. It would seem like investors would be knocking on the door to have a part of this great technology that this company is about to produce. I would love to sometime be able to visit California, visit this particular company, although I am not sure how practical it is. And I would encourage the gentlewoman to come to the Fifth District of Texas and speak to the people who are having to pay for this bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

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

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

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

Mr. HENSARLING. 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 Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. 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. CAMPBELL of California:

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

None of the funds in this Act may be used for the following:

Ala Wai Canal feasibility study
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for Wailupe Stream Flood Damage Reduction Investigation
Consortium for Plant Biotechnology Research, GA
Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Funds, North Hempstead, New York
Fumer Creek, NY
Moyer Creek, NY
University of North Alabama Green Campus Initiative (AL)
Upper Mississippi River System Navigation and Ecosystem Sustainability Program
Ouachita and Black Rivers Navigation Project
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for Bayou DeSiard, Monroe, LA
J Bennett Johnston Waterway, Louisiana
Ouachita River Levees, Louisiana
Camp Ellis, Maine
Gulf of Maine Research Institute Laboratory Upgrades, Maine
Port of Pittsburgh Commission
Kennedy Health System, Voorhees, New Jersey
Steele Creek, NY
Upper Susquehanna River Basin Environ Rest, Cooperstown, NY
Stillwater, MN Flood and Retaining Wall Project, St. Croix River
Mt. St. Helens Sediment Control, Washington
Columbia River Channel Improvements, Oregon and Washington
Columbia River at Baker Bay, WA
Puget Sound and Adjacent Waters Restoration, Washington
Comite River Diversion Canal, Louisiana
Bayou Sorrel Lock, Louisiana
Louisiana State University Ag Center
Lake Belle View, Wisconsin
BioEthanol Collaborative, SC
Augusta, Georgia U.S. Army Corps of Engineers study
City of Atlanta, Environmental Infrastructure
Biorefinery and Hydrogen Fuel Cell Research, Development and Demonstration Project, Georgia
Sustainable Energy Research Facility Construction, Frostburg State University, MD
Johnson Creek Project, Arlington, Texas
Advancing Texas Biofuel Production Project, Baylor University, Texas
Center for Renewable Energy, Science, and Technology (CREST)
Jupiter Oxygen Inc., Dallas, Texas
Army Corps of Engineers Des Plaines River Project
Army Corps of Engineers Squaw Creek (Round Lake Drain) project
Ballona Creek Restoration, CA
Los Angeles River Ecosystem Restoration, CA
Sun Valley Watershed Management Plan, County of Los Angeles, CA
Tujunga Wash Environmental Restoration, County of Los Angeles, CA
Arroyo Seco Watershed Management Plan Feasibility Study, CA
City of North Las Vegas Water Reuse Facility, NY
Las Vegas Wash Improvement Project, Nevada
Channel Improvement Program, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Memphis District
White River, AR
White River Navigation Study, AR
Bayou Metro Basin, AR
Ethanol from Agriculture for Arkansas and America project, Arkansas State University, Arkansas
Ozark Powerhouse Rehabilitation project, Arkansas
Mississippi River Levees project, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Memphis District
Orland Wetlands Project, IL
Aquatic Invasive Species Dispersal Barriers, Chicago District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, IL
Lockport Lock Upper Pool Major Rehabilitation and Maintenance, Rock Island District of the U.S.
Army Corps of Engineers, IL
North San Diego County Water Recycling Project, CA
Shoreline restoration Tarpon Springs, FL
Logan Cancer Center Equipment and Technology, Intermountain Health Care Logan Regional Hospital, UT
Chattahoochee Dam Removal, GA
Underground waste pipeline integrity, Albany, GA
Fire Island Montauk Point Study, NY
Wolf River, TN
Lower Columbia River Ecosystem Restoration project, OR
Table Rock Lake, MO
High School Branch creek study, MO
Missouri Alternative Renewable Energy Technology Center, MO
Jordan Creek, Springfield, MO
USA Cancer Institute Oncology Medical Record System, University of South Alabama, AL
Coosa-Alabama civil works project, AL
Whitewater River Basin Flood Control project, CA
Murriets Creek Flood Control project, CA
Rancho California Water District water study project, CA
Pine Mountain Lake, AR
National Center for Reliable Electric Power Transmission, AR
Agana (Hagatna) River Flood Control, Guam
Webbers Falls Lock and Dam, OK
Beaver Creek flood control project, VA and TN
Philpott Lake, VA
Levisa and Tug Forks of Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, WV, KY, and VA
Calcasieu Lock, Louisiana
Southwest Coastal Louisiana Hurricane Protection Study, LA
Gulf Petro Initiative, University of Louisiana at Lafayette, LA
Florida State University Electric Grid System Study, FL
Horseshoe Cove, Dixie County, FL
Clinton Lake, Kansas
Manhattan Levee Study, KS
Kansas Flood Damage Reduction project, Topeka, KS
Town Bluff Dam, Texas
Schuylkill River at Grand Point, PA
MRI machine, Memorial Hermann Baptist Orange Hospital, TX
Philadelphia Naval Shipyard Seawall, Philadelphia Industrial Development Corporation, PA
Environmental Science Center, University of Dubuque, IA
Lock and Dam 11 project, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Rock Island District, IL
Hogan's Creek Ecosystem Restoration, FL
Jacksonville Harbor, FL
Jacksonville Marine Science Research Institute, FL
Georgetown Harbor, South Carolina
Wauchula Municipal Electric Substation Rehabilitation, FL
Wares Creek Flood and Coastal Storm Damage project, FL
Port Manatee, FL
Pecan Creek, Texas
Center for Advanced Scientific Computing and Modeling, University of North Texas, TX
Upper Trinity River Basin, TX

EnerDel Inc., IN
Indiana Wesleyan University School of Nursing, IN
Martin County Hydrogen Fuel Cell Development, NC
Dismal Swamp Canal, VA
Heacock and Cactus Channels flood control, CA
San Clemente Shoreline, CA
Inland Empire Regional Water Recycling Project, CA
Upper Newport Bay Ecosystem Restoration, CA
Santa Anna River Mainstem flood control, CA
Leland Harbor, MI
Great Lakes Fishery and Ecosystem Restoration, MI
Boardman River Dam project, MI
Imaging and Oncology Equipment, Intermountain Healthcare, UT
Central West Virginia, WV
Marmet Lock and Dam, WV
Santa Clara River Watershed Protection Plan Feasibility Study, CA
Capinteria Shoreline Study, CA
Matilija Dam Removal and Ecosystem Restoration, CA
Lake Cachuma Water and Sewage Treatment Replacement Project, CA
Emmanuel College Center for Science Partnership, MA
Muddy River Ecosystem Restoration and Flood Damage Control Project, Massachusetts
San Joaquin County Urban Flood Protection Project, CA
San Joaquin River Salinity Management, CA
Saint Genevieve levee, MO
St. Louis North Riverfront feasibility study, MO and IL
St. Louis Flood Protection, MO
Nicholson Borough Authority, Wastewater Collection and Treatment Facility, PA
Towanda Municipal Authority Public Water Expansion, PA
Whitpan Township, Pennsylvania
White River (North) Flood Damage Reduction Project, Indianapolis
Williamson County Water Recycling Project, TX
Cardiac Catheterization Research and Equipment, Metroplex Hospital, TX
Middle Brazos Feasibility Study, Brazos River Authority, TX
Wilmington Harbor project, New Castle County, DE
Vehicle to Grid Demonstration Project, Delaware Energy Office, DE
Bethany/South Bethany Beach Replenishment Project, Delaware
Good Samaritan Hospital Specialty Cancer Center, OH
Xavier University Science Equipment, OH
Central Riverfront Project, OH
Eastern Kentucky University Chemical Research Instrumentation, KY
Bluegrass Pride, KY
Green Visitor Center, Brooklyn Botanic Garden, NY
Blue River Channel, Kansas City, MO
City of Kansas City Water Services Department, MO
Swope Park, Kansas City, MO
Turkey Creek Basin, Kansas City, MO
Brush Creek Basin, Kansas City Water Services Department, Kansas and Missouri
Kansas City Plant Multi-Disciplined Integrated Collaborative Environment, Kansas City, MO
Feasibility study Edisto Beach, South Carolina
Lake Marion Regional Water Agency, SC
EngenuitySC, Columbia, SC
South Carolina HBCU Science and Technology Initiative (SC)
Wolf River Harbor, Memphis, Tennessee
Memphis Riverfront Development Project, TN
O.C. Fisher Lake Ecosystem Restoration, TX
Lower Colorado River Basin Study, TX
J. Percy Priest modifications, US Army Corps of Engineers Nashville District
Mill Creek Watershed feasibility study, TN
SemiTropic Phase II Groundwater Banking project, CA
Alton to Gale Levees Districts, IL
Wood River Levee, IL
East St. Louis and Vicinity Ecosystem Restoration and Flood Damage Reduction, IL
Belleville (IL) project, Madison and St. Clair Counties
Mystic River Harbor Commission, CT
Long Island Sound Dredged Material Management Plan, Army Corps of Engineers New England District, CT and NY
Pinhook Creek Flood Control Project, Huntsville, AL
Integrated Environmental Research and Services (IERS), Alabama A and M, University Research Institute
Fernandina Beach shore protection project, FL
Bronx River Basin, Army Corps of Engineers New York District
Orchard Beach, Army Corps of Engineers New York District
Soundview Park, Army Corps of Engineers New York District
Casper College Renewable Energy Program, WY
Energy-Efficient Green Campus Research Initiative, Texas A and M International University (TX)
Alliance for Nanohealth, TX
Brays Bayou, Harris County Flood Control District
Buffalo Bayou flood control, Harris County Flood Control District
Marshall Fund, Minority Energy Science Initiative, MD
Baltimore Harbor and Channels project, Maryland Department of Transportation
Poplar Island project, Maryland Department of Transportation
Eastern Shore, Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island project, Maryland Department of Transportation
McCook Reservoir Project, Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago
Chesapeake Bay Oyster Recovery, MD and VA
Tennessee-Tombigee Waterway, Tennessee Waterway Development Authority
Roosevelt University Biology Laboratory Equipment (IL)
Greenup Locks and Dam Ohio River, Huntington District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Coal Fuels Alliance, KY and IN
Cumberland County Water Supply, TN
Belmont Bay Science Center, VA
George Mason University Center for Biodefense and Infectious Disease Research (VA)
Broad Creek shallow draft navigation channel, Norfolk District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Utility Integration of Distributed Generation, San Diego Gas and Electric, CA
Buford Dam and Lake Sydney Lanier (GA), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Mobile District
International Port of Coos Bay, OR
Siuslaw River project, Oregon
Port of Umpqua, OR
Wave Power Demonstration Project, Reedsport, OR
Chatfield Reservoir water reallocation study, CO
Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program and San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Upper Colorado Region
Ecosystem Restoration project, Treat's Pond, MA
Aunt Lydia's Cove, New England District of the Army Corps of Engineers
Sesuit Harbor (MA), New England District Army Corps of Engineers
Green Harbor (MA), New England District Army Corps of Engineers
Long Island Dredged Material Management Plan, Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection
Lehigh River Basin Release, Army Corps of Engineers Philadelphia District
Advanced Cellular and Biomolecular Imaging, Lehigh University (PA)
Biodiesel Injection Blending Facilities, Independence Biofuels, PA
Air Products and Chemicals Inc., PA
Center for Collaborative Sciences and Research, Barry University, FL
University-Community Outreach, Research and Training Endeavor, St. Thomas University (FL)
Everglades Ecosystem Restoration, Seminole Tribe, FL
Makah Community Water supply project, Makah Tribe, WA
Grays Harbor Navigation Improvement Project, WA
Inland Northwest Research Alliance Water Research Consortium, WA
Pugent Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration study, WA
Skagit River Flood Control project, WA
Green Duwamish Ecosystem Restoration Project, Seattle District Army Corps of Engineers
Mud Mountain Dam, Army Corps of Engineers Seattle District
National Center for Manufacturing Sciences, MI
Port of Monroe, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Detroit
Great Lakes Sea Lamprey Barrier, Great Lakes Fishery Commission
Spring Lake Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Project, Texas
Michigan City Harbor Dredging project, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Chicago
Notre Dame Innovation Park, IN
Placer County Subregional Wastewater Treatment Project, CA
Placer County Biomass Utilization Pilot Project, CA
American River Pump Station, CA
Three Rivers Wet Weather Demonstration Project, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Pittsburgh, PA
Lower Monongahela Improvement Project for Locks and Dams 2, 3, and 4, PA
Nuvision Engineering, PA
Lynnhaven River Environmental Restoration, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, VA
Norfolk Harbor, Craney Island, Army Corps of Engineers Norfolk, VA
Plug-in Hybrid Electric Vehicle Demonstration, South Coast Air Quality Management District, CA
San Gabriel Basin Restoration Fund, CA
Pistol Creek, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Nashville District
First Creek, Knoxville, TN
Nuclear Security Science and Policy Institute, Texas A&M University
Meridian Wetlands, Meridian, TX
Whitney Lake Powerhouse, Whitney, TX
San Antonio Channel Improvement, San Antonio, TX
Dallas Floodway Extension, Upper Trinity River Basin, TX
Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Conservation Project, Waco, TX
Houston-Galveston Navigation Channel, TX
Clear Creek, TX
Texas A&M University Port of Freeport, TX
Upper Trinity River Feasibility Study, TX

Texas City Ship Channel, Galveston, TX
The Brazos River Authority, TX
Lower Colorado River Basin Study
Guadalupe and San Antonio River Basins
Greens Bayou, Houston, TX
Brazos Island Harbor
Lake Whitney, TX
Brazos Island Harbor, TX
Houston Ship Channel, TX
Minnehahah Creek Watershed District, MN
University of Southern Indiana
John T. Myers Locks and Dam, IN and KY
Illinois Institute of Technology's Energy and Sustainability Institute
DePaul University's Interdisciplinary Science and Technology Center
Cape Girardeau Floodwall, MO
Rolla Distributed Energy Research Center, MO
Clearwater Dam Rehabilitation, Clearwater Lake, MO
Brois Brule Drainage and Levee District
Wappapello Lake, MO
St. Johns-New Madrid Floodway Flood Control Project, MO
Mississippi River Levees, MO
Ramapo and Mahwah River Project, NY
Rockland Community College Science Lab
Presque Isle Shoreline Erosion Control Project, PA
Clean and Efficient Diesel Locomotive Project, PA
Direct Carbon Technologies, CA
Nanosys, Inc, CA
San Mateo County Harbor District
California Coast Conservancy
Integrated Biomass Refining Institute, North Carolina State University, NC
Robert F. Henry Lock and Dam, AL
Ground Water Protection Council, OK
Watsonville Area Water Recycling Project, CA
Pajaro River Flood Control Project, Santa Cruz, CA
Moss Landing Harbor, CA
Education Advancement Alliance, PA
City of Philadelphia Water Department
Rosa Bay Environmental Restoration Project, FL
Florida Inland Navigation District
Raritan River, Green Brook Sub-Basin, NJ Flood Damage Reduction Project
Salton Sea Research Project, Temecula, CA
Dismal Swamp and Dismal Swamp Canal Feasibility Project, Chesapeake, VA
Tyler's Beach Boat Harbor and Channel/Upland Disposal Site, Isle of Wight, VA
Appomattox River Federal Navigation Dredging Project, VA
Chesapeake Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway-Dismal Swamp Canal, VA
Antelope Creek Flood Damage Reduction Project, Fremont, NE
Sand Creek Environmental Restoration Project, NE
Western Sarpy-Clear Creek Flood Damage Reduction Project, NE
Lower Platte North Natural Resources District, NE
Rio Puerto Nuevo Flood Control Project, Puerto Rico
Portugues and Bucana Rivers Flood Control Project, Puerto Rico
Appalachian State University
Wake Forest University Health Sciences, Winston Salem, NC
Muddy River Ecosystem Restoration and Flood Damage Control Project, MA
Westport River and Harbor, MA
Colorado River Transmission Line Upgrade, Phoenix, AZ
Saint Clare's Hospital, Denville, NJ
Upper Passaic River & Tributaries, NJ Project
New York and New Jersey Harbor Deepening Project, Port Authority of NY and NJ
Raritan River, Green Brook Sub-Basin, NJ Project
Jackson Brook, NJ Flood Damage Reduction Project
Hudson River Estuary Lower Passaic River Restoration Project, NJ
Calleguas Municipal Water District, CA
Albright College, Reading, PA
St. Joseph's University, PA
Johnson Matthey Fuel Cells North America, PA
University of Arizona, Tuscon, AZ
Big Elk Creek, Elkton, MD
Chesapeake Bay Restoration, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District
Upper Delaware River Basin
New York City Watershed, NY
Office of Sponsored Programs and Research, Bowling Green State University, Green, OH
Defiance County, Office of the Commissioners, Defiance, OH
Lake Allatoona Operations and Maintenance, Allatoona, GA
Nueces River Basin, San Antonio, TX
John H. Kerr Dam and Reservoir, VA and NC
Center for Energy Efficient Design, Rocky Mount, VA
Roanoke River Flood Control, Roanoke, VA
J Percy Priest Greenway, Nashville, TN
Oaklands and Murfree Springs, Nashville, TN
Dale Hollow Lake, Nashville, TN
Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, TN
Central City Corps Project, Fort Worth, TX
Farmers Branch, Fort Worth, TX
Benbrook Lake Recreational Facilities, Forth Worth, TX
Harris Country Flood Control District, Houston, TX
Yuma East Wetlands Restoration, Yuma, AZ
Chicago Public Schools Science Laboratory, Chicago, IL
Northeast Texas Community College, Mt. Pleasant, TX
Photovoltaic System Demonstration, NY
Lock and Dam 24, IL and MO
Mill Creek South Slough, Rock Island, IL
Rock Island Sunset Marina, Rock Island, IL
Intelligent Optical Systems, Inc, Torrance, CA
West Basin Municipal Water District, Carson, CA
County of Los Angeles Department of Beaches and Harbors, Marina del Rey, CA
Sherman Hospital, Elgin, IL
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Pacific Northwest Regional Office, Boise, ID
Herbert Hoover Dike, West Palm Beach, FL
St. Lucie Inlet, St. Lucie Country, FL
Levine Children's Hospital, Charlotte, NC
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC
Nye County, Pahrump, NY
Photovoltaic green buildings technology art RPI, NY
Truckers Meadow Water Reclamation Facility, Sparks, NY
Sacramento River, Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District, CA
Hamilton City, CA
Yuba River, Sacramento, CA
Sutter County, CA
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Mid-Pacific Region, Sacramento, CA
Perkins Country Rural Water System, Bison, SD
Mni Wiconi Rural Water System, Ft. Pierre, SD
Lewis and Clark Rural Water System, Sioux Falls, SD
Buffalo Harbor, NY
Buffalo River, Buffalo, NY
NanoDynamics, Buffalo, NY
Ohio River Greenway Development Commission, Jeffersonville, IN
Next Wave Systems, H.H.C., Pekin, IN
Solar Consortium, New Paltz, NY
Barbers Point Harbor, Oahu, HI
Kawaihae Deep Draft Harbor, HI
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Honolulu District, Fort Shafter, HI
Mason Run Watershed, City of Whitehall, OH
Airpark Ohio Sewer Utility, Springfield, OH
Village of Blooming burg, OH
Culpepper Area Water System, OH
Euclid Creek, OH
Decision Support Tools for Complex Analysis, Springfield, OH
Hydro Partners Brazil, Solon, OH
IntelliTech, Fairborn, OH
Columbus Children's Hospital, Columbus, OH
Ohio University, Lancaster, OH
Brown Street, University of Dayton, Dayton, OH
Laboratory for Advanced Laser-Target Interactions, College of Math and Physical Science, Ohio State University
New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services, Concord, Columbus, NH
Arcadia Harbor, MI
Pentwater Harbor, MI
Saugatuck Harbor, MI
White Lake Harbor, MI
Sweet Arrow Lake, PA
SiGNa Chemistry, New York, NY
Assunpink Creek, Trenton, NJ
Delaware River Basin, NY, NJ, PA, DE
Guadalupe River, CA
San Luis Reservoir, CA
Coyote and Berryessa Creeks, CA
Tillamook Bay and Bar, Tillamook, OR
Yaquina River, OR
Paint Branch Fish Passage and Stream, MD
Parish Creek, Anne Arundel County, MD
St. Jerome Creek, St. Mary's County, MD
Anacostia River and Tributaries, MD
Clemson University, Columbia, SC
Northport Harbor, Huntington, NY
New York Institute of Technology, NY
San Luis Rey River, Los Angeles, CA
Science and Technology Center, Chicago State University, Chicago, IL
Indian Ridge Marsh, Chicago, IL
Chicago Shoreline, Chicago, IL
Cook County, IL
Alexandria, LA to the Gulf of Mexico Hurricane Protection Project, New Orleans, LA
Lake Shelbyville Wildlife Management Area, Shelbyville, IL
Dallas Floodway/Trinity Lakes Title XVI Study, City of Dallas, TX
Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, IL
Dansby Hall, Morehouse College, Atlanta, GA
City of Mayfield Heights, OH
Wind Spires, Cleveland State University, Cleveland, OH
Cuyahoga Community College, Cleveland, OH
Green Bay Harbor, Detroit, MI
Kewaunee Harbor, Detroit, MI
Sturgeon Bay Harbor and Lake Michigan Ship Canal, MI
Lackawanna River, Scranton, PA
Wynn Road, Oregon, OH
Pit-in-Bay, Put-in-Bay, OH
Huron Harbor, OH
Ten Mile River, MA
Saginaw River, MI
Wyandotte Municipal Services, Wyandotte, MI
City of Alma Fish and Wildlife Service, Alma, WI
Driftless Area Initiative, Lancaster, WI
Jones Inlet, Town of Hempstead, NY
Glen Cove Creek, Glen Cove, NY
Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, GA
Savannah Harbor, GA
Brunswick Harbor, GA
Waukegan Harbor, IL
Des Plaines River, IL
Palm Beach Harbor, FL
Broward County, FL
National Center for Manufacturing Sciences, Ann Arbor, MI
Wavecrest Labs, Rochester Hills, MI

Federal Technology Group, Cleveland, OH
Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, NY
Spunky Bottoms, Brown County, IL
Upper Missouri River Restoration, IL
Meredosia, IL
Illinois River Basin, IL
Lakeview Museum, Peoria, IL
Memorial Medical Center, Springfield, IL
Fountain Creek Watershed, Colorado Springs, CO
Charlestown Breachway Project, Massachusetts
Harbor of Refuge, Block Island, Rhode Island
San Francisco Bay Harbor—Main Ship Channel, California
Photovoltaic Demonstration Project, Connecticut
Southington Water Supply Study, Connecticut
The Winnebago River reconnaissance study, Iowa
General Investigations study in Perry, Iowa
Iowa Stored Energy Project
Luther College Science building renovation, Decorah, Iowa
Iowa Central Community College Renewable Fuel Labs
West Jackson Street Water Main Replacement, Painesville, Ohio
Allen Road/McCauley Road Waterline Construction, Stowe, Ohio
Ashtabula River and Harbor, Ashtabula, Ohio
Oakland Harbor, California
Clinton River, Michigan
Loma Linda University Medical Center, Loma Linda, CA
South Coast Air Quality Management District, Diamond Bar, CA
Hi-Desert Water District, Palms Highway, Yucca Valley, CA
Mojave Water Agency, Apple Valley, CA
Santa Ana River, San Bernardino, California
San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District, 1350 South E. Street, San Bernardino, CA 92408
Mission Springs Water District, Desert Hot Springs
Morehouse School of Medicine, 720 Westview Drive, SW, Atlanta, GA 30310–1495
University of Kentucky's Center for Applied Energy Research, Kentucky
Northern Illinois University Fuel Research and Development, DeKalb, Illinois
Cook County Environmental Infrastructure Fund, Chicago, Illinois
Townsend Inlet, Cape May, New Jersey
City of Pennsville, New Jersey
New Jersey shore protection, New Jersey
Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa
Santa Clara Valley Water District, Santa Clara, California
South County Nature Preserve, Irvington, New York
Saw Mill River feasibility study, New York
Bronx River Basin, New York
University of Oklahoma Center for Biofuels Refining Engineering, Norman, Oklahoma
Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency, Sacramento, California
Parametric Technology Corporation, Needham, Massachusetts
Muddy River, Massachusetts
Massachusetts Port Authority, East Boston, Massachusetts
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Lee County, Sarasota County and Manatee County, Florida
Naples to Big Marco Pass, Collier County, Florida
Estero and Gasparilla Islands, Florida
Intracoastal Waterway, Jacksonville, Florida
St. Lucie Inlet, Florida
New York City Watershed, New York, New York
Solar 2—Green Energy, Arts & Education Center, New York, New York
McHenry County Groundwater/Stormwater Protection program, Chicago, lllinois
Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts
Malden River, Malden, Massachusetts
Town of Winchester, Massachusetts
Middlesex Community College, Lowell, Massachusetts
Ben Hill County Commission, Fitzgerald, Georgia
Clean Cities Program, Macon, Georgia
Olijato Chapter of the Navajo Nation, Monument Valley, Utah
Westminster College, Salt Lake City, Utah
Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York
City of Lancaster, California
CureSearch, Bethesda, Maryland
Harriet Island, St. Paul, Minnesota
Minnesota's New Museum of Natural History, Minneapolis, Minnesota
J. Bennett Johnston Waterway, Louisiana
Shreveport-Bossier Community Renewal, Inc., Shreveport, Louisiana
Elliot Bay Seawall, Seattle, Washington
Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Study, Seattle, Washington
Duwamish/Green Ecosystem Restoration Program, Seattle, Washington
Puget Sound and Adjacent Waters Restoration Program, Washington
Eikos Inc., Franklin, Massachusetts
Upper Blackstone Water Pollution Abatement District, Millbury, Massachusetts
Blackstone River Coalition, Massachusetts
NuVision Engineering, Mooresville, North Carolina
State University of New York at Oswego (SUNY Oswego), Oswego, New York
Catalyst Renewables Corporation, Lyons Falls, New York
New Topsail Inlet, North Carolina
Carolina Beach Inlet, North Carolina
Lockwoods Folly Inlet, North Carolina
Wilmington Harbor, North Carolina
Santa Clara River Restoration Project, California
Eastern Santa Clara River basin Perchlorate Remediation Initiative, California
Walla Walla Watershed Feasibility Report, Washington
Columbia Basin Development League, Royal City, Washington
Electric Utility Transmission and Distribution Line Engineering Program at Gonzaga University, Washington
Farmington Groundwater Recharge Project, California
San Francisco Bay to Stockton Project, California
Mt. Diablo Mercury Mine Cleanup, California
Mokelumne River Regional Water Storage and Conjunctive Use Project, California
State University of New York College of Agriculture and Technology at Cobleskill, New York
Virginia Key Beach project
Jamaica Bay (Port Authority of New York and New Jersey)
Atlantic Coast New York City, East Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay, NY Shoreline Project
Houma navigation Cal Dredging and Beneficial Use
Flagler Beach feasibility study, Florida
Reconnaissance Study of Deep Creek for St. Johns County, Florida
Stetson University's Sage Hall, DeLand, Florida
Bucks Harbor, Machiasport, Maine
Greenville Steam Company, Greenville, Maine
Los Angeles River, California
Port of Long Beach, California
Long Beach Desalination Project, California
Long Beach Water Refuse Project, California
City of Creedmoor Corps Study, North Carolina
North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina
Lexington Harbor, Michigan
Port Sanilac Harbor, Michigan
Lepeer Regional Medical Center CT Stimulator, Michigan
Escambia and Conecuh Rivers, Florida
Santa Ana River Mainstem Project, California
Orange County regional water reclamation project, CA
Suisun Bay Channel, California
San Pablo Bay and Mare Island Strait, California
Pinole Shoal management study, California
Napa River Salt March Restoration Project, California
Lower Walnut Creek, California
Mt. Diablo Mercury Mine Cleanup, Costa County, California
Trinity River Restoration Program, Weaverville, California
Walnut Creek Basin (Grayson & Murderer's Creeks), Contra Costa County, California
Va Shly-Ay Akimel Salt River Restoration, AZ
Tres Rios Environmental Restoration, Arizona
Rio Salado, Phoenix and Tempe Reaches, Arizona
Parkersburg Riverfront Park project, New Martinsville, West Virginia
Monongahela Locks Automation project, Morgantown, Hildebrand and Opekiska Locks, West Virginia
West Virginia and Pennsylvania Flood Control project, Philippi, Parsons and Belington West Virginia; Clymer Pennsylvania
Turkey Creek flood damage reduction project, Kansas City, Kansas and Missouri
Upper Turkey Creek project, Kansas
Kansas City Metropolitan flood protection system, Kansas and Missouri
Bush Creek Basin project, Johnson County, Kansas and Jackson County, Missouri
Four Mile Run environmental restoration project, Virginia
Tripps-Holmes-Cameron Run-Hunting Creek water resources study, Virginia
National Venter for Biodefense, Virginia
University of Kansas Medical Center Tele-Oncology Network, Kansas
Greater New Haven Clean Cities Coalition, New Haven, Connecticut
Electro Energy, Inc., Danbury, Connecticut
Environmental restoration feasibility study, Upper South Hampton Township, Pennsylvania
Philadelphia Navy Yard Seawall, Delaware River, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Flood Plain Management Study, Pennsylvania
CENTRIA, Moon Township, Pennsylvania
Dams and Locks on the Monongahela River, Pennsylvania
Conversion of Waste Biomass into Biodegradable Plastics and Bioethanol: Research on a New Streamline Biomass to Sugar Conversion Process, Indiana, Pennsylvania
Concurrent Technology Corporation, Johnstown, Pennsylvania
South Central Pennsylvania Environmental Infrastructure Program
Structural and nonstructural flood control, stream bank protection, storm water management and channel clearing, Southwestern Pennsylvania
Sustainable Biofuels Development Center, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado
Upper Colorado River/San Juan River basin Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Colorado

Sorghum to Ethanol Research, Lubbock, Texas
Building Materials Reclamation Program, Charlotte, North Carolina
RenewableNY project, New York, New York
New School University Green Building, New York
Coney Island Area Shore Protection Project, New York, New York
Norwalk, California, Water Supply Improvement
Pioneer Valley Life Sciences Institute ($2 million), Springfield, Massachusetts
Wind Science and Engineering Research Center, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas
J. Strom Thurmond O_2 System for Richard B. Russell Pumped Storage
Success Dam Seismic Remediation Project, California
Upper San Joaquin River Storage Investigation, California
Laurentian Energy Authority, Minnesota
Garrison-Kathio-West Mille Lacs Lake Sanitary District, Minnesota
Section 569 authorized in the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, Minnesota
St. Lawrence Seaway Study
Duluth-Superior Harbor maintenance and operations, Minnesota and Wisconsin
Northern Wisconsin Environmental Assistance Program
Protection of endangered mussels, Minnesota, Wisconsin and Michigan
City of St. Croix Falls, Wisconsin
Lake Superior Small Harbor Dredging, Michigan
A second lock at Sault St. Marie, Michigan
St. Croix River Basin Reconnaissance Study, Minnesota and Wisconsin
Mt. Wachusett Community College Wind Project, Massachusetts
Integrative Science Building, UMASS, Amherst, Massachusetts
Milford Pond, Milford, Massachusetts
Hoosic River Restoration Design, Massachusetts
Berkshire Environmental Resources Center, Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts, North Adams, Massachusetts
Popular Brook Continuing Authorities Program, New Jersey
Shark River Maintenance Dredging project, New Jersey
Nutley Board of Education, Nutley, New Jersey
Peckman River and Tributaries, New Jersey
Rio Salado Oeste project, Salt River, AZ
Achieving a College Education (ACE) program, Maricopa Community Colleges, Arizona
Phoenix Metropolitan Water Reuse project, Arizona
Rio de Flag project, Flagstaff, Arizona
Seton Hall University Science and Technology Center, South Orange, New Jersey
Newark Bay, Hackensack, and Passaic Rivers operation or maintenance, New York and New Jersey
High Efficiency Cascade Solar Cells, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico
San Francisco MUNI Solar Energy Facility Project, California
Hamilton Army Airfield Wetland Restoration Project, California
San Francisco Bay Harbor and Bay Drift Removal project, California
San Francisco Bay Long Term Site-Monitoring Strategy, California
University of San Francisco Science Facility and Hamey Science Center, California
Renewable & Logistical Fuels for Fuel Cells at the Colorado School of Mines, Colorado
Jefferson County Bioenergy Initiative, Colorado
White Earth Tribal Nation Wind Energy Project, Minnesota
Willmar Municipal Utilities Power Generation Study, Minnesota
Stripper Well Consortium, Penn State University, College Park, Pennsylvania
Bath house and camping area at Tioga-Hammond Lake, Pennsylvania
Bath house and playground equipment at Tionesta Dam, Pennsylvania
Bath house and camping area at Cowanesque Lake, Pennsylvania
Campground improvements at East Branch Clarion River Chippewa River at Montevideo, Minnesota
Strategic Biomass Initiative of the Mississippi Technology Alliance, Mississippi
Sustainable Energy Research Center, Mississippi State University, Starkville, Mississippi
Laboratory facilities, Messiah College, Grantham, Pennsylvania
Garrison Diversion Project, North Dakota
Fargo-Ridgewood Flood Control Project, North Dakota
Garrison Dam and Power Plant, North Dakota
Sierra Trauma Center, St. Rose Dominican Hospitals, Las Vegas, Nevada
West Cary Stream Restoration project, Cary, North Carolina
Upground reservoir, Marysville, Ohio
5th Avenue Dam removal, Olentangy River, Columbus Ohio
Timberlake Wastewater upgrades, Franklin County, Ohio
Florida Renewable Energy Program, University of Florida, Gainesville
Friant-Kern and Madera Canals Capacity Improvement, California
Greenbrier River Basin, West Virginia
Robert C. Byrd Locks and Dam, Ohio River, West Virginia, and Ohio
Southern West Virginia environmental infrastructure projects, West Virginia
Fuel Cell balance-of-Plant Reliability Testing Prototype High Altitude Airship Project, Stark State College of Technology, North Canton, Ohio
Louisville Wastewater Treatment Plant, Louisville, Ohio
Orrville water main replacement, Orrville, Ohio
Rolls-Royce Solid Oxide fuel cell systems development, Fuel Cell Proto typing Center at Stark State College
Center for Zero Emissions Research and Technology, Montana
State University, Bozeman, Montana
Western Environmental Technology Office, MSE Technology Applications, Inc., Butte, Montana
Fort Peck / Dry Prairie Rural Water System, Montana
King County Biogas and Nutrient Reduction Project, Washington
Seattle Cancer Care Alliance Proton Beam Therapy, Washington
Dine Power Authority Project, Window Rock, Arizona
Little Colorado River Levee project, Winslow, Arizona
Sparks Arroyo Flood Control, Colonia, El Paso, Texas
El Paso Flood Control project, El Paso, Texas
Mill Seat Landfill Bioreactor Renewable Green Power Project, Monroe County, New York
Alternative Energy/Geothermal Technology Demonstration Program, Daemen College, Amherst New York
Pikeville Medical Center medical science research facility, Pikeville, Kentucky
Paintsville Lake recreational improvements, Johnson County, Kentucky
Southern and Eastern Kentucky Environmental Restoration Initiative, Kentucky
Wolf Creek Dam Seepage project, Kentucky
Southeast Bioenergy Initiative, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama
MBI International biomass research, Lansing, Michigan
Intermediary BioChemicals, Okemos, Michigan
Energy Efficient Press and Sinter of Titanium Powder, Glendale Heights, Illinois
Miami Museum of Science Renewable Energy Project, Miami, Florida
Florida Keys Water Quality Improvement, Monroe County Florida
Lower Saddle River Project, New Jersey
Hackensack Meadowlands Environmental Restoration, New Jersey
Port of Los Angeles, Main Channel Deepening Project, California
Water Replenishment District Regional Groundwater Monitoring Program, Lakewood, California
Jackson Park Hospital Green Medical Office Building, Chicago, Illinois
Parker Hannifin Corporation Hybrid Hydraulic Drive Train Demonstration, Youngstown, Ohio
NorthEast Ohio Pipeline Scooping Study, Mentor, Ohio
Baard Energy L.L.C., CO2 Production & Emissions Study, Mentor, Ohio
Lower Girard Dam Repairs, Girard, Ohio
Struthers South Interceptor Sewer Project, Youngstown, Ohio
Windham to Ravenna Arsenal Infrastructure Project, Ravenna, Ohio
Brookfield Center North Sanitary Sewer—Phase II, Vienna, Ohio
Animas-LaPlata Project, Durango, Colorado
Arkansas River Fisheries Habitat Restoration, Pueblo, Colorado
Los Angeles Basin Water Supply Augmentation Study, California
La Mirada Flood Control and Drainage Study, California
Barnegat Inlet Navigation Project, New Jersey
Solid Acid Fuel Cell Research, California
Metropolitan Region of Cincinnati flood control project, Duck Creek, Ohio
Perry Township Waterline Extension, Ohio
Williamsburg Water Treatment Plant Expansion, Ohio
Borough of Hatfield wastewater and sewer infrastructure improvements, Pennsylvania
Elizabeth River sediment remediation, Hampton Roads, Virginia
Cheyney University Science and Technology Building, Cheyney, Pennsylvania
Stamford Waste-to-Energy Project, Conecticut
Bridgeport Harbor, Conecticut
Norwalk Harbor Federal Navigation Project, Connecticut
Portsmouth Harbor/Pascataqua River Feasibility Study for Navigation Improvement, Portsmouth, NH
Wiswall Dam Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Project, New Hampshire Fish and Game Department, Durham, NH
Cocheco River Federal Navigation Project, Maintenance Dredging, Dover, NH
Hampton Harbor Improvement Project, Pease Development Authority, Division of Ports and Harbors, Portsmouth, NH
Hampton Harbor Maintenance Project, Pease Development Authority, Division of Ports and Harbors, Portsmouth, NH
Olmstead Lock and Dam Project, USACE Louisville District, Louisville, KY
Energy Xchange, Yancey County Local Government, Burnsville, NC
Western North Carolina Clean Energy Business Incubator Consortium, Asheville, NC

South Central Pennsylvania Environmental Improvement Program, Altoona-Blair County County Development Corporation, Altoona, PA
Eastern Idaho Regional Wastewater Authority, City of Shelley, Idaho
Harbor Deepening Project at the Port of New York and New Jersey, Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, New York, NY
Green Department of Public Works/Fleet Maintenance Project, Town of North Bergen's Green
Maintenance Building, Township of North Bergen, North Bergen, NJ
Olcott Outer Harbor Breakwater Project, Niagara County Department of Economic Development, Sanborn, NY
Dredging of the Genesee River at the Rochester Harbor, Buffalo District
Nanosystems Initiatives at the University of Rochester, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY
Nanostructured Solar Cell Project, University of Arkansas at Little Rock, Little Rock, AR
University of Saint Francis Achatz Hall, University of Saint Francis, Fort Wayne, IN
Monday Creek Watershed, Hocking River, Huntington, WV
Arbaugh-Hope Water Project, Vinton County Commissioners, McArthur, OH
South Carolina Lambda Rail Portal, Clemson University, Clemson, SC
National Energy Resource Center, York Technical College National Energy Resource Center, York Technical College, Rock Hill, SC
Estudillo Canal Feasibility Study, San Francisco, CA
Jack D. Maltester Channel (San Leandro Marina), San Francisco, CA
Dredging of Menominee Harbor, Menominee River, Detroit, MI
Michigan Technological University Nanostructured Materials Development project, Michigan Technological University, Houghton, MI
Traverse City Harbor Dredging at Northwestern Michigan College, Traverse City, MI
McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System, Locks and Dams, Tulsa, OK
City of Elyria Water Treatment Plant Water Intake Project, Elyria, OH
Flood Control Project, Sandy Creek, TN
Flood Control Demonstration Project, West Tennessee Tributaries, Obion and Forked Deer River, West, TN
Pinole Shoal Management CA/Delta Long Term Management Strategy for Delta Levee rehabilitation, Contra Costa County, CA
Contra Costa Water District Alternative Intake Project, Contra Costa County, CA
Napa River Shallow Draft Dredging, San Francisco, CA
West Sacramento Flood Control Project Deficiency Study and Repair, Sacramento, CA
Dredging of Noyo Harbor, Fort Bragg, CA
Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel Dredging, Sacramento, CA
Warm Springs Dam Inundation maps, San Francisco, CA
EI Dorado Lake, KS (O&M), Tulsa, OK
Oologah Lake Watershed, Oklahoma and Kansas, Tulsa, OK
Equus Beds Division of the Wichita Project, City of Wichita, Wichita, KS
Sustainable Energy Solutions, Wichita State University, Wichita, KS
Federal Maintenance Dredging of the Newburyport Harbor Entrance Channel, Concord, MA
Silicon Based Solid Oxide Fuel Cell Chip for Portable Consumer Electronics, Lilliputian Systems, Wilmington, MA
Urban Environmental Research Center and Greenhouse Project, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, NY
Holes Creek Flood Protection Project, Miami Conservancy District, Dayton, OH
Edison Materials Technology Center (EMTEC) Hydrogen Energy Production and Storage—Phase IV, Edison Materials Technology Center, Dayton, OH
South Goose Creek, Cottonwood Pond, Boulder County, CO
Canyon Road Water Treatment Plant Upgrade, Sante Fe County, Sante Fe, NM
Jicarilla Apache Reservation Rural Water System, Rio Arriba County, Dulce, NM
Navajo Hopi Land Commission Office Renewable Energy Generation Project, Window Rock, AZ
St. Joseph Harbor, St. Joseph, Detroit, MI
Dredging the harbor at South Haven, MI, Detroit, MI
Sustainable Energy Center, Biodiesel from farmed algae, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI
Bioscience Education Center, Germantown Innovation Center, Life Sciences and Technology Park of the Germantown Biotechnology Project, Germantown, MD
Jupiter Oxy Fuel Technology Project, Illinois
Northwest Indiana Computation Grid, Indiana
Pilot Energy Cost Control Evaluations, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Indiana
Purdue Calumet Island Water Institute, Indiana
Purdue Hydrogen Technologies Program, Indiana
Waste-to-Energy Cogeneration Project, Munster, Indiana
CIMTRAK Cyber Security software, Indiana
Bioenergy Cooperative ethanol biomass fuel plant, Indiana
Little Calumet River, Indiana
Indiana Harbor—Grand Calumet River Environmental Dredging, Indiana
Burns Waterway Small Boat Harbor, Indiana
Burns Waterway and the Bailey intake pipe, Indiana
Calumet Region Environmental Infrastructure, Indiana
Cedar Lake, Indiana
Notre Dame Geothennal Ionic Liquids Research, Indiana
Purdue Technology Center, Indiana
Indiana Shoreline, Indiana
Oregon Institute of Technology Geo-Heat Center, Klamath Falls, Oregon
Port of Umatilla biodiesel refining plant, Pendleton, Oregon
Savage Rapids Pumping Plant, Rogue River Basin, Oregon
Umatilla Basin Project, Umatilla County, Oregon
Elk Creek Lake permanent trap-and-haul facility, Oregon
Walla Walla River Restoration Feasibility Study, Oregon
Environmental System Center at Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York
Rochester Institute of Technology Integrated Power Microsystems, Rochester, New York
Woody Biomass Project at State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry
Limestone Creek, Fayetteville, New York
Onondaga Lake, New York
Irondequoit Harbor, New York
Minnesota Center for Renewable Energy, Minnesota State University Mankato
Blue Earth Ecosystem Restorations, MN, SD, IA, ND
Chickamauga Lock, Tennessee River, TN
Port Everglades Future Dredging Program, Florida
Seminole Big Cypress Critical Project, Everglades and South Florida
The Methanol Economy, University of Southern California
Science and Technology Facility, Bennett College, Greensboro, North Carolina
Vermont Independent Colleges Zero-Energy Campaigns, Vermont
Canaveral Harbor, Florida
Illinois State University Biomass Research, Illinois
Perry Memorial Hospital Picture Archiving and Communication System (PACS), Illinois
Will County Government, Illinois
Port Everglades Dredging Reimbursement Project, Broward County, Florida
Kentucky Lock and Dam Addition Project, Tennessee River, Kentucky
Elvis J. Stahr Harbor Project, Hickman-Fulton County, Kentucky
DeSoto County Wastewater Treatment Facility, Mississippi
New Albany Electrical Substation, Mississippi
Carbon sequestration study, Mentor, Ohio
New Mexico Center for Isotopes in Medicine, University of New Mexico
Ecosystem Revitalization at Route 66, Albuquerque, New Mexico
Rio Grande Bosque Rehabilitation (Bosque wildfires), New Mexico
Middle Rio Grande Bosque, New Mexico
Petaluma River Flood Control, California
Corte Madera Creek, California
North Bay Water Reuse Project, CA
San Rafael Channel Dredging, California
Tools for the Nanotechnology Education Development Program, Oregon
Tualatin Basin water supply project, Oregon
CVD Single-Crystal Diamond Optical Switch, Maryland
Water Infrastructure Project, Mill Creek basin, Louisville, KY
Water Infrastructure Project, Louisville, KY
McAlpine Locks and Dam, Ohio River, Louisville, KY
Math and Science Educational Project, Louisville Science Center, Louisville, KY
Pinellas County Beach Erosion Control Project, Pinellas County Board of Commissioners, Clearwater, FL
WaterReuse Foundation Research Activities, WaterReuse Foundation, Alexandria, VA
Eckerd College Science Center, Eckerd College, St. Petersburg, FL
Chenega IRA Council, Chenega Bay, AK
Technology Initiative for Print Disabled Community, Recording for the Blind and Dyslexic, Princeton, NJ
Kotzebue Electric Association's Wind Program, Kotzebue Electric Association, Kotzebue, AK
Renewable Energy Biomass Utilization Program, Alaska Village Initiatives, Anchorage, AK
Tanadgusix Foundation's Hydrogen Project, Tanadgusix Foundation (TDX), Anchorage, AK

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This particular amendment would eliminate all the earmarks in the bill, all 800 of them, all $1.1 billion of them.

Now, I have two confessions to make about this amendment before I proceed

here. Confession number one is that the amendment is rather inartfully drafted. And the way it is drafted, it may actually catch some things, some elements of spending, that were not technically part of the 800 earmarks in the bill. But the reason for that is that the 800 earmarks are not actually in the bill. Something I would like to address later. But the amendment is drafted the only way it can be drafted under the current situation, under the current process, to eliminate all of these 800 earmarks and $1.1 billion.

The second confession I would like to make is that one of those 800 earmarks that is in the bill is one I requested. Now, I believe a couple other Members requested it as well, but it is definitely one that I requested.

So you may be asking why would I be proposing an amendment to eliminate an earmark that I requested. Do I suddenly believe that the earmark that I requested is somehow not valid or somehow not appropriate? No. Had I believed it was not valid or not appropriate when I requested it some months ago, I would not have requested it.

But the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that the process by which these earmarks happen stinks. And I believe that this process is terrible and that until we reform this process, we should eliminate all earmarks.

And that, Mr. Chairman, is why I offer this amendment to you today. It is not because I think that necessarily all 800 earmarks, including my own, in this bill are inappropriate. I do think $1.1 billion is more money than I would like to see relative to this or any earmarks. But it is because until we reform this process and have a process that works, I don't think we should do any earmarks at all.

The earmark process has, I believe, actually hurt not just Republicans and Democrats and not just taxpayers, but I believe it has hurt this institution. And I believe that is why Chairman OBEY, the gentleman from Wisconsin, has expressed his own distaste for earmarks and the earmark process.

So let me make a few suggestions, 10 of them precisely, if I may, as to how this process might be reformed, how we might get it right.

First, put the earmarks in the bill. The reason we have had to draft this amendment so oddly is because the earmarks are not actually written in the text of the bill. If we are going to spend the taxpayers' money as Members of Congress on specific things, those specific things we are spending it on should be in the language of the bill that appropriates those expenditures.

Second, let's have full disclosure of all the earmarks in the bill and let's have it at least a week before the vote. I think we got the list of these earmarks last, I think it was, Thursday or Friday, and here we are debating these today. There are 800 earmarks in this bill. It is a little tough for us or anyone else to go through 800 earmarks in just a couple of days.

Third, let's have full disclosure of all earmark requests. Every earmark in this bill in theory has a certification from the Member who requested it claiming what they have requested and why and also claiming that they have no financial interest in that earmark. Let's make those public. Those were turned in, I can't remember exactly whether it was February or March. I think it was March. Why should those be under some secrecy? Why should all those earmark requests not be available to the public? And when we have full disclosure of earmarks, let's have real disclosure of earmarks. The disclosure that we got last week was one list that has the earmark amount and the project and another list that has the project and the Member requesting. So if you want to take the Member requesting and match it up with the amount, you have to match up the two lists somehow. Now, if there are only 10 earmarks, you could do that. But with 800 it is really hard to do, and not in a searchable database. In fact, in a few cases where we were able to get disclosure of the actual earmark request, which only happened yesterday afternoon, the description of the project in the earmark request is not the same as the description of the project on the earmark list. So what we have now is an attempt at some late partial disclosure. It is not full disclosure in any way, shape, or form of earmarks or earmark requests.

Mr. OBEY has suggested that Members often feel like they are ATMs. That is what this earmark process does. It diminishes, I think, the value of all of us that serve in this institution. We are here to make public policy. We are not ATMs. I was stunned when, in my first few months as a Member of this House, 70 different people came into my office not asking for a certain element of public policy, not encouraging me to support this or that or the other, but asking for money, asking for earmarks, because they saw Members of Congress as an ATM.

Number four, we should not have any earmarks for programs that are not authorized; otherwise, why do we bother to authorize programs? If we are not going to go through the process of authorizing a program, then earmarks can come in and be about anything. I think that is what you have seen in some of Mr. HENSARLING's and Mr. FLAKE's objections is that earmarks have become about almost anything.

Number five, we should not have earmarks that do not serve a Federal interest and have a Federal nexus. This is Federal taxpayers' money.

□ 1430

There are many great needs out there in cities, counties and States, but cities and counties and States have sources of revenue. It's not like we don't have enough to do here. It's not like we don't have other things that we could spend the money on. God forbid we might give it actually back to the taxpayers. But even if we weren't going to do that, there are obviously plenty of truly Federal priorities that we should not be fixing sewers and other things like that, which are clearly local priorities.

Six, we should not be including earmarks that are requested outside of the State of a Member of Congress. Now, the point of these earmarks is to direct funds for things that our constituencies need. Why would we ever be wanting to direct funds for things that some other constituency needs? We know why. It's because some lobbyist or something somewhere requested it. So let's not be requesting or honoring earmarks that are outside of one's State.

Seven, we shouldn't be giving earmarks to private entities without some kind of a competitive bidding process. You know, if other elements of the Federal Government were to award contracts for millions of dollars to private entities without some kind of bidding process, we would complain about it here. And we do complain about it when we see it, and we should complain about it when we see it. But yet under this earmark process, many earmarks are given directly to private entities without any competitive bidding process.

Eight, conference reports should never increase an earmark. Now, everything we could do here in the House to disclose and provide sunshine for earmarks could be null and void if you simply can drop earmarks into a conference report that were not in either the House or the Senate version of the bill. So we should never have earmarks coming back to this floor that are more than the amount that was in either the House or the Senate version of that bill.

Nine, earmarks should be available for discussion at a hearing. We're spending the public's money. It should be exposed, what we're doing; it should be clear to people what we're doing; and we should talk about it and be willing to stand up and defend it, or not do it.

Ten, when we eliminate earmarks, the money we save should go into debt reduction. It should save the taxpayers' money. It should go to reduce the Federal deficit.

Now unfortunately, if this amendment were to pass, I would love to tell you that the $1.1 billion to the taxpayers would be saved, but the way the rules are, it would take another amendment, a subsequent amendment to then save that money for the taxpayers.

Mr. CULBERSON of Texas offered an amendment in the Appropriations Committee to change that rule so that if we do strike and/or eliminate any number of earmarks, that that money saved is actually saved, that it goes to debt reduction. But that amendment was defeated.

So, Mr. Chairman, those are 10 things that could put sunshine on this earmark process. But we are a long ways

from that sunshine. We are a long ways from that accountability. We are a long, long ways from all these earmarks being visible, justifiable and, in fact, justified.

So until then, I have made and will continue to make proposals to eliminate all the earmarks in any bill regardless of whose they are, myself included, or others, until we reform the process.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I would be happy to recognize my friend and ranking member, Mr. HOBSON from Ohio, for such time as he may consume.

Mr. HOBSON. I would like to thank my chairman.

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

We have put together, I think, a very good bill. This bill is $31.6 billion. The earmarks and the directed spending in this supplemental we're talking about today is about 3 percent of the bill, it's $1.09 billion. There are 777 projects. This includes the plus-ups to the administration's request. In some cases the administration asked for some money, we decided it wasn't quite enough to finish off something, so we added money to it.

Let me talk a little bit about the Corps. The administration requested $4.08 billion for 837 projects. The House adds $777 million for 466 projects. There are no new authorizations or new starts. And sometimes the President asks for new starts, Members ask for new starts; we don't have enough money to do new starts, so we stopped new starts.

The earmarks are 14 percent of the total Corps' budget. I might add, when we started with the Corps of Engineers, the Corps didn't have a 5-year development plan, they had no vision of where it really wanted to go. It didn't come from the administration to change that, it came with the chairman and myself working together. We changed that in the Corps. That didn't come out of the administration, those nameless people down there who somehow figure out how they're going to spend the money. At least here we know who's spending the money and we know the projects that we're looking at.

Title II. The administration requested $551 million for 146 projects. The House added $72 million for 47 projects.

In DOE, in title III, the House adds $246.5 million for 263 projects. This represents less than 1 percent of the total DOE budget, which is $32 billion. This is a 50 percent cut to the fiscal year 2006 level. And I might say on the Republican side, it is now a 40 percent split versus the 60 percent as the majority changed. I think we've done a good job at looking at people's needs.

Let me give an example. In my State, ODOT is the big highway people, and they always want to do these big projects. And when I want to do something in my town that really impacts people within my city, they don't have time to do it. And even when I do an earmark, they fight me on the earmark because they want to do the big deals. They want to do the big projects that cost a lot of money. And they take care of people, too. But at the local community, I think sometimes we are better off at what we want to do versus what the large agencies want to do.

So I want to thank the chairman, and frankly, the staff, who has looked through all these projects. We've looked through all these projects. We've vetted these projects. And we've done as good a job as I think we can in looking at them. And we're not the technical people, but the staff is more technical. We've gone back on the Corps projects and talked to Corps of Engineers and said, do these projects make sense? Are they executable? Can we get them done? And they've come back and said yes. So we have had a review.

I think this is a well done bill. I think the earmarks are essential to Congress doing its oversight. I wish, frankly, we could work better with the administration on their earmarks. We don't know what they're going to do. They don't come and talk to us. Even in the hearings, we have no idea where they're going to spend all their money on the projects they want.

I think it would be a better process if we could all work together and have more transparency, and did more things at the local level. And we could take out a lot of the bureaucracy that exists in those huge bureaucracies that we tend to fund without anybody ever questioning how much money they're spending there.

And I don't want to pay more taxes either. I think the projects here that we do help the quality of life within the communities where we live.

I support the bill. I'm opposed to this amendment. And I would request that Members oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for this wonderful amendment.

I rise today out of a concern for what earmarks are doing to this body. Those of us on the Republican side understand very well the perils of unfettered earmarks. It's part of the reason we're squarely in the minority today. But there are greater concerns than which party is in the majority. I hope that each of us, Republicans and Democrats, would recognize this.

Proponents of earmarking defend the practice by noting that Article I of the Constitution gives Congress the power of the purse, and that earmarking is consistent with that responsibility. It is true that Congress has the power of the purse. But the contemporary practice of earmarking circumvents, rather than enhances, the careful execution of our responsibility as stewards of the public purse.

Take the Labor-HHS bill that will be coming up later today; it contains 1,300 earmarks. Are we to assume that each of these 1,300 has been properly vetted and scrubbed? No way. I suspect that, just as the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee noted a couple of weeks ago, there is no way to adequately screen these earmarks given the tight appropriations schedule. The question needs to be asked, why are we so bent on moving forward with 1,300 earmarks?

I should note that last year there were no House earmarks in the Labor-HHS bill. The world didn't come crashing to a halt. The year before there were no House earmarks in the Labor-H bill. The planets are still in order today.

Why are we so bent on moving forward when we can't adequately vet these earmarks?

Perhaps the most frequent justification for the contemporary practice of earmarking is that ''Members of Congress know their districts better than some faceless bureaucrat in Washington.'' Now, I'm not here to defend faceless bureaucrats. They waste a lot of money in my district, as well as others. Faceless bureaucrats in Federal agencies waste so much money that somebody needs to be constantly looking over their shoulder and providing oversight. That's why we're here. But let's face it, when we approve congressional earmarking for indoor rain forests in Iowa or teapot museums in North Carolina, we make the most spendthrift faceless bureaucrats look frugal.

Excess by Federal agencies does not excuse congressional excess. If Federal agencies don't follow the procedures requiring competitive bidding or other processes, then we should cut their funding and/or mandate that they change their practice. We shouldn't try to one-up them with equally suspect appropriations.

Just as an aside, we saw just a couple of weeks ago that the majority of this Chamber chose to deny funding for one particular earmark. Now, for the RECORD, it was my amendment to cut funding for the ''Perfect Christmas Tree Project.'' There was no Federal nexus, and I didn't think it was a wise use of Federal dollars. But it was no less worthy than hundreds of projects funded by the same legislation.

The distribution of earmarks is based on politics, not policy. Most appropriation bills award 60 percent of the earmarks to the majority party and 40 percent to the minority party. Is there a policy reason for this allocation that has reversed with every legislation? Are well-positioned Members who award themselves with more earmarks than rank-and-file Members more deserving? Are their districts more

needy? In some appropriation bills, each member of the committee is given an equal share. Are we to assume here that these districts have exactly the same needs?

The truth is, we can try all we want to to conjure up some noble pedigree for the contemporary practice of earmarking, but we are just drinking our own bath water if we think the public is buying it.

It seems that over the past few years we've tried to increase the number of earmarks enough so that the plaudits we hear from earmark recipients will drown out the voices of taxpayers who have had enough. It hasn't worked, thank goodness. For every group that directly benefits from earmarks, there are hundreds who see it as a transparent gimmick to assure our own reelection.

Mr. Chairman, our constituents deserve better. This institution deserves better than we're giving it. Let's return to the time-honored process of authorization, appropriation and oversight that has served us well for so long.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would reserve the balance of my time, understanding I have the right to close, and I will be the final speaker on our side.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, Mr. FLAKE said it very well. This House can do better than this earmark process. We can do better than what is going on. Their earmarks have led to some of our colleagues who are now in jail. It has led to other problems with other colleagues. Let's reform it or get rid of it.

This amendment is the beginning of that process. And Mr. Chairman, I would urge Members, even if they have earmarks in this bill, to support the beginning of reform or elimination of what has hurt this institution and has hurt taxpayers so much.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the time and will begin my remarks in opposition, first of all, by again thanking my friend and colleague from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON), all of the members of the subcommittee, and the staff, who have done a very good job on this bill and improved the circumstances for people's safety, health, security and employment opportunities.

I would like to make a couple of points. The first is, we've heard a lot about the expenditures that are enumerated in this legislation, and that certainly is worthy of debate. What has been lost today, but was covered earlier this year when the bill originally was on the floor, is the fact that there are significant cuts that have been made in this bill to programs that we felt could be either eliminated or reduced because they did not have the same value and merit as those contained in the legislation we're considering today.

And I would note that there were 37 different DOE weapons programs that were cut. There were an additional 20 programs, two in the Army Corps of Engineers, two in the Bureau of Reclamation, three within the independent agencies, and 13 others in the Department of Energy that were reduced because we did not feel that they cut mustard and did not make the same significant contribution to our country.

□ 1445

As far as our infrastructure, and I would want to focus on that for a few minutes, the investment in our water infrastructure, for example, in this legislation represents a little bit less than 20 percent of the overall spending. But I would note that in 2005, the American Society of Civil Engineers estimated that nearly 50 percent of the Corps of Engineers-maintained locks are functionally obsolete using a design life of 50 years. Many of our communities do not enjoy the benefit of adequate flood protection.

We think of moving the commerce of this country. We think of people's safety. We are woefully behind. There are numerous channels and harbors throughout our Nation, across this country, that are not maintained at usable depths, much less at the authorized levels. Again, for every ship that uses a channel or a harbor not at depth, they are coming in and they are leaving lighter. That is less efficient as far as the economy of our country.

The Corps of Engineers' backlog is $50 billion. One thing that I would note for the membership here is that during the last several years under Mr. HOBSON's leadership as chairman, one of the things that we have tried to do is, if you would, to focus funds on some programs to meet that backlog, to make sure that some projects ultimately are completed.

I would also point out that the committee is mindful of the responsibility that we all have in Congress regarding ensuring that Federal funds are spent in a responsible manner. This committee has been at the forefront of changes to the fiscal management of the Corps of Engineers.

In light of the challenges involved in modernizing this Nation's water resources infrastructure, we have required, again, over the last several years, a more disciplined and rigorous approach to fiscal and contract management by the corps. This bill continues financial management contracting reforms to ensure that the corps manages its budget in the best interests of the taxpayers. The recommendations include directing that the corps continue to take action in considering additional factors as they proceed in the planning of projects.

Outside of water infrastructure, we do have the Department of Energy that encompasses obviously more than three-quarters of the spending in this bill. As was noted when we brought the bill to the House floor, regrettably, as a citizen, as a public official, I would note that since 1990, the Department of Energy has been on the high-risk list of the GAO for project management.

That is all of our money. One of the things that we have, again, attempted to do in this bill is to begin to force the issue with the Department so these major construction projects are brought in on time and on budget.

As I mentioned, and I will close on this note, in my remarks at the beginning of the debate, we started today, the money spent in this bill, whether they were enumerated originally by the administration or by the Congress, are investments, investments in our national security and in the safety and reliability of our nuclear weapons. They are investments in our energy security, which is now in economic crisis, a national security crisis and an environmental crisis. We have increased funding for biofuels. We have increased funding for vehicle technology. We have increased funding for renewable energy research. I am proud of the subcommittee's work in those areas.

We have made investments in the health of our people, in that if you have clean water to drink, you are going to enjoy good health. If you do not, you are going to become very sick. We have also looked at the health of those citizens around our country who live in and around former weapons sites and the nuclear cleanup that is going to unfortunately still take decades to accomplish. These are investments in the safety of our citizens. Think about those dams in this country. Think about one of those locks failing. Think about the gentleman in Highland, Indiana, who lost his life when the Little Calumet River flooded.

They are investments to create a climate and to build the infrastructure of our Nation that encourages the development of new, well-paying jobs. To the extent we have made changes in the administration's priorities, whether they be by earmarks or changes in programs, those changes have been to enhance the effectiveness of the programs in this bill and to complement them.

Mr. Chairman, for all of these reasons, I certainly am opposed to the gentleman's amendment, I would ask my colleagues to oppose it, and I would ask for my colleagues' support of the underlying legislation.

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

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

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

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. 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 California will be postponed.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOBSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) for such time as he may consume.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I want to thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding, and I want to thank the body for its indulgence as we wrap up this important debate.

I want to describe and discuss an amendment I was going to offer but did not and some of the reasons for it. Contained in this bill is a $2 million earmark for the Parker Hannifin Company of Cleveland, Ohio, for the hybrid drivetrain program.

I am not going to offer the amendment for three very important reasons. One is the earmark was requested by my good friend and neighbor, Congressman Tim Ryan; two, in doing research on the hybrid drivetrain program, it is a good one, and three, Parker Hannifin is a great company that I am going to talking about in a minute.

But my amendment would have redirected the $2 million from the hybrid drivetrain program to their plant in Eastlake. Parker Hannifin has announced their intention in the near future to close a plant in Eastlake, Ohio, and cause the loss of 177 jobs.

Most of the folks that work there have been working there for a number of years and are members of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers. But I want to talk a little bit about Parker Hannifin and why I am not offering the amendment and then have a request at the end.

Parker Hannifin Company was started in 1918 by a guy named Arthur Parker. Just to show you how some of our entrepreneurs have had tough experiences, in 1919 there was a truck accident that wiped out the entire inventory of the company, and he had to go back to another job. He started again; and at the height the Depression, he bought an auto plant in 1935 in the City of Cleveland, and then during the height of World War II, employed 5,000 people in Cleveland, Ohio, supplying the war effort.

The war ended. Mr. Parker died. Again, the defense contracts dried up. It looked like there wasn't going to be any progress for the company. His widow said no, and they continued to reinvest in northeastern Ohio and northeastern Ohio continued to reinvest in them and they rewarded them as well. Today, they are a $10 billion company employing 50,000 people worldwide.

My simple request is, I am not going to ask to redirect this money to the plant in Eastlake, Ohio, but as this bill moves forward, I would hope that we can continue to talk to the folks in Cleveland and Parker Hannifin, because if you think about this $2 million, some of those 177 machinists who potentially will lose their jobs paid into the Federal Treasury some of the money that comprises this $2 million that is going to the hybrid drivetrain project, and I hope that we are able to resolve this in a way that we not only have the new technology for fuel efficiency that comes from the hybrid drivetrain technology, but given northeastern Ohio's solid commitment to this company since 1918, that they take that into consideration as we move forward and they make tough decisions in this global economy as to whether or not these jobs remain in northeastern Ohio.

Again, I very much thank the ranking member and the chairman for their indulgence.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, if my colleague would yield for a moment, I certainly appreciate the gentleman striking and yielding the time.

Again, I understand and appreciate the gentleman's concern and his passion about this. Obviously, I cannot make any representations, other than I would want to stay in touch with both gentlemen and see what can be done and to work closely with you.

But I appreciate again the circumstances you find yourself in and would be happy to try to work with you.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank both gentlemen for their comments, and I yield back my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

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:

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 35 by Mr. HENSARLING of Texas.

Amendment No. 37 by Mr. HENSARLING of Texas.

Amendment No. 39 by Mr. HENSARLING of Texas.

An amendment by Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on an amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) 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 98, noes 326, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 636]

AYES—98

Akin
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Brady (TX)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carney
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Conaway
Cooper
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Ehlers
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gillmor
Gohmert
Graves
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McHenry
McKeon
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Souder
Stearns
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)

NOES—326

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey

Lucas
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Bishop (GA)
Bordallo
Brown, Corrine
Davis, Jo Ann
Faleomavaega
Granger
Hill
Hoyer
Kucinich
Napolitano
Solis
Tancredo

□ 1519

Messrs. POMEROY, CROWLEY and KANJORSKI changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Messrs. SHIMKUS, NUNES, CARNEY and Mrs. BIGGERT changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 636, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 636 on H.R. 2641 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Remaining votes in this series of votes will be 2-minute votes. There will be a 1-minute warning and then a 2-minute vote.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) 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 70, noes 357, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 637]

AYES—70

Akin
Bachmann
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Burton (IN)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Conaway
Cooper
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Feeney
Flake
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Graves
Hastert
Heller
Hensarling
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Linder
Mack
McHenry
Mica
Miller (FL)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Walberg
Westmoreland

NOES—357

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Bordallo
Brown, Corrine
Davis, Jo Ann
Faleomavaega
Granger
Hoyer
Kagen
Kucinich
Tancredo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining to vote.

□ 1524

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) 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 79, noes 337, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 638]

AYES—79

Akin
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Conaway
Cooper
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Feeney
Flake
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Graves
Hastert
Heller
Hensarling
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
McCaul (TX)
McHenry
Miller (FL)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Ramstad
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Walberg
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)

NOES—337

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—20

Ackerman
Bordallo
Boswell
Brown, Corrine
Carnahan
Christensen
Davis, Jo Ann
Dicks
Faleomavaega
Gonzalez
Hoyer
Johnson, Sam
Kirk
Kucinich
Marchant
Napolitano
Radanovich
Tancredo
Welch (VT)
Weller

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 1527

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) 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 81, noes 348, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 639]

AYES—81

Akin
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Conaway
Cooper
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Feeney
Flake
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves
Heller
Hensarling
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
McHenry
Miller (FL)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Smith (NE)
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Walberg
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)

NOES—348

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)

Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Bordallo
Brown, Corrine
Davis, Jo Ann
Faleomavaega
Hoyer
Kucinich
Tancredo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1533

Mr. WAXMAN 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 MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) 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 39, noes 388, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 640]

AYES—39

Akin
Blackburn
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Chabot
Cooper
Deal (GA)
Flake
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Goode
Heller
Hensarling
Issa
Jindal
Jordan
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Linder
Miller (FL)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Ryan (WI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Westmoreland

NOES—388

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Abercrombie
Bordallo
Brown, Corrine
Cuellar
Davis, Jo Ann
Faleomavaega
Hoyer
Kucinich
Tancredo

□ 1537

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2008''.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleagues, my good friend from Indiana and chair of the subcommittee, Mr. VISCLOSKY, and Chairman OBEY, for bringing up this important piece of legislation.

I rise in support of the supplemental report on H.R. 2641.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the subcommittee leadership for their inclusion of $18.3 million for the Houston Ship Channel Navigation project, which is $2 million more than the President's budget, and for including $15.442 million in operations and maintenance

for the Houston Ship Channel, which is $1 million over the President's request.

While I understand the tight fiscal constraints this Congress is under, I hope we increase funding for these projects in the future.

The continued O&M funding would be used to keep the channel at its authorized depth, which is critical to keeping the channel navigable for the tankers that bring in crude oil to our refineries. The navigation funding goes towards important environmental restoration work in the deepening and widening project. We are at the end of that project now.

Our area relies heavily on Corps of Engineers' funding, since we're not only an energy-producing area but also a low-lying area in the middle of a flood plain.

I requested funding through the Army Corps of Engineers for Greens Bayou, Hunting Bayou and Halls Bayou, which were flooded during Tropical Storm Allison in 2001. These authorized projects are located in blue-collar residential areas in my district, where the threat of future flooding is all too real.

I am grateful the subcommittee included $588,000 for Greens Bayou, which will help conclude the study portion of the project and now the project is fast approaching its construction phase. The Greens Bayou project has a high 3.7 benefit to cost ratio, and in 2001, over 15,000 homes in this watershed flooded in Tropical Storm Allison.

I appreciate the committee's continued understanding of the pressing flood control needs in our area, but am disappointed only Greens Bayou received funding in this appropriations cycle.

Hunting Bayou has already started construction and a cut-off of Federal funding threatens to put this project into danger of falling further behind schedule. Fortunately, this is a 211 (f) project which provides the local sponsor—the Harris County Flood Control District—flexibility to continue work on the project.

The Hunting Bayou project will reduce the number of homes and businesses in the 100-year flood plain by 85 percent, from 7,400 structures to 1,000. Eight thousand homes flooded in this area during Tropical Storm Allison as well.

I also hope Halls Bayou will receive funding in the future; this project is authorized in WRDA 1990 and is included in the pending WRDA legislation to become a Sec. 211(t) project.

Greens Bayou, Hunting Bayou, and Halls Bayou are not projects to protect vacation homes or homes in obvious flood hazard areas. Most of these areas were outside the flood plain until upstream development expanded the flood plains.

In closing, I want to commend the Chairman, and especially my good friend from Texas, Congressman CHET EDWARDS, for their hard work on this legislation, and hope they will continue their progress on funding critical needs across the Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support the supplemental report.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, in accordance with House earmark reforms, I would like to place into the record a listing of the Congressionally-directed project in my home state of Idaho that is contained within the report to this bill.

The project provides $4 million within the Army Corps of Engineers Section 595 program for rural water infrastructure upgrades in Idaho communities. The funding was authorized in the Water Resources Development Act.

This funding is critical to assisting rural Idaho communities in upgrading their water and wastewater treatment facilities. In many cases, this funding is required to comply with unfunded mandates passed down by this Congress and federal agencies.

Perhaps the most striking example of why the federal government has a responsibility to assist these communities is the burden the EPA's revised arsenic standard is having across America. In addition, these funds help rural communities in Idaho trying to attract new businesses and spur economic development. The vital water funding in this bill will assist rural communities in job creation and affordable housing by offering improved services at lower costs than would otherwise be possible.

I'm proud to have obtained this funding for Idaho communities and look forward to working with them in the future to meet their water resource challenges.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide a list of Congressionally-directed projects in my region and an explanation of my support for them.

1. Rural Idaho Environmental Infrastructure, $4,000,000.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2641, the Energy & Water Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2007. I applaud our colleagues on the Energy & Water subcommittee for producing a bill that fully funds some of this nation's most important basic research under the Office of Science.

In particular, I commend chairmen OBEY and VISCLOSKY, ranking member HOBSON, and my fellow Long Island colleague, Mr. ISRAEL, for their tireless support of ground-breaking research conducted at Brookhaven National Laboratory.

I'm proud to represent BNL and the talented scientists who keep our nation at the cutting edge of basic research with projects like the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider, which helps scientists unravel the big bang theory to explain the origins of our universe.

Fully funding this research will avert the same kind of uncertainty that threatened to derail it last year. Preserving BNL's status as a leading research institution will hopefully result in more decisions like yesterday's announcement that BNL will be the permanent home of the NSLS II, which uses intense light for x-ray imaging.

I also want to commend the committee for allocating $7 million for the Fire Island to Montauk Point project, which would protect 83 miles along Long Island's south shore.

Mr. Chairman, fully funding these research and infrastructure priorities are good for this nation and our economy. I am proud to support H.R. 2641 and again commend our colleagues for a good bill and their hard work.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. 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. MCNULTY) having assumed the chair, Mr. TIERNEY, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2641) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, he reported 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. Under House Resolution 481, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? 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.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 312, nays 112, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 641]

YEAS—312

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Camp (MI)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston

Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—112

Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Berkley
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Gohmert
Graves
Hall (TX)
Heller
Hensarling
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (NY)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Lamborn
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Mack
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reynolds
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Tiahrt
Walberg
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf

NOT VOTING—7

Bean
Brown, Corrine
Davis, Jo Ann
English (PA)
Jones (NC)
Kucinich
Tancredo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1557

Mr. SULLIVAN and Mr. BILBRAY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BLOCKING PROPERTY OF CERTAIN PERSONS WHO THREATEN STABILIZATION EFFORTS IN IRAQ—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110–47)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, as amended (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) (IEEPA), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order blocking property of persons determined to have committed, or to pose a significant risk of committing, an act or acts of violence that have the purpose or effect of threatening the peace or stability of Iraq or the Government of Iraq or undermining efforts to promote economic reconstruction and political reform in Iraq or to provide humanitarian assistance to the Iraqi people. I issued this order to take additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003, and expanded in Executive Order 13315 of August 28, 2003, and relied upon for additional steps taken in Executive Order 13350 of July 29, 2004, and Executive Order 13364 of November 29, 2004. In these previous Executive Orders, I ordered various measures to address the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States posed by obstacles to the orderly reconstruction of Iraq, the restoration and maintenance of peace and security in that country, and the development of political, administrative, and economic institutions in Iraq.

My new order takes additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13303 and expanded in Executive Order 13315 by blocking the property and interests in property of persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, to have committed, or to pose a significant risk of committing, an act or acts of violence that have the purpose or effect of threatening the peace or stability of Iraq or the Government of Iraq or undermining efforts to promote economic reconstruction and political reform in Iraq or to provide humanitarian assistance to the Iraqi people. The order further authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, to designate for blocking those persons determined to have materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, logistical, or technical support for, or goods or services in support of, such an act or acts of violence or any person designated pursuant to this order, or to be owned or controlled by, or to have acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this order.

I delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, the authority to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to the President by IEEPA as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of my order. I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 17, 2007*.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3043, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, during consideration of H.R. 3043 pursuant to House Resolution 547, the Chair may reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting under clause 6 of rule XVIII and clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 547 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3043.

□ 1601

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3043) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with Mrs. TAUSCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, this bill, more than any other, determines how willing we are to make the investment necessary to assure the future strength of this country and its working families. We strengthen the country when we strengthen our families. We strengthen our country when we invest in workers to have the most competitive workforce in the world.

The decisions we make in any one year are not decisive. But if we do not think in long term, if we do not recognize the kind of country we will be in 10 years, we will not make the investments necessary to prepare for that world and we will be shortchanging the future of every American.

Because he has chosen to put his desire to give $50 billion in tax breaks to those make $1 million a year, and his desire to spend $140 billion on Iraq ahead of those investments, the President has chosen to cut those investments by this bill by more than $7.5 billion in real terms.

This bill rejects most of those cuts because we cannot disinvest in the country's future without hurting national security and the future of every American family. Instead of cutting $7.5 billion, as the President requested, we eliminate or cut 41 programs, saving $1.1 billion. We then increase investments in critical programs by about $4.5 billion in real terms, or 2.8 percent over last year, after adjusting for inflation and population change.

Now, why do we do that? Because in 10 years there will be 27 million more Americans, 12 million more seniors needing health care, 2.7 million more kids in elementary and secondary school, 2.2 million more students in college, 11 million more Americans will be without health insurance, unless we wise up and wake up and change our policies. And within 7 years, half of the Nation's job growth will be in occupations requiring higher education skills.

To meet those challenges, with this bill we target modest increases to crucial high priority activities to attack deficits in worker training, deficits in health care, deficits in education access.

On a bipartisan basis, without a dissenting vote, we've provided $450 million above the President's inadequate request for Title I to help an additional 155,000 disadvantaged students. Instead of wiping out every student aid program except Pell and Work Study, we rejected the President's cuts and raised the maximum Pell Grant by $650 over the last year to help over 5 million students go to college.

We reversed the 3-year decline in Federal support for special education. Mr. WALSH, the ranking member of this subcommittee, has taken a leadership role in that regard.

We reversed the President's cuts in teacher training. We provided new after-school opportunities for 163,000 more students.

On health care, nobody has ever come up to me at home and said, ''OBEY, why don't you guys get your act together and cut cancer research?'' But that's exactly what Congress did the last 2 years, cutting NIH research grants by over 500 grants. Well, we've stopped that.

In January, we reversed the President's cuts and this bill adds another $1 billion above the President's request, which would again cut research grants.

We have also included a package of five initiatives to put health care within the reach of more than 2 million additional Americans; $200 million to expand access to health and dental care at community health centers, $75 million to help States expand health coverage for targeted populations, $50 million to help States provide affordable health insurance for 200,000 people who are medical high risks and cannot get insurance from the private market, $20 million to help trade impacted workers benefit from the Health Coverage Tax credit, and added funding to help Medicare beneficiaries to get health insurance counseling.

Because of high energy prices, we have added $880 million to the President's request for low income heating assistance, reversing half the cut Congress and the President made last year.

To discourage abortions, instead of lecturing, we provide a $1.4 billion package of incentives to provide real world help to women through expanded Head Start, child care, domestic violence programs, maternal and child health care, family planning and abstinence programs.

To help workers, we reverse the President's cuts in a range of workforce training programs. We also provide a $100 million increase above the President to help reduce Social Security claims backlogs and to keep more Social Security offices open.

Now the President claims that this bill amounts to runaway spending. Fact: From 1980 to today, domestic appropriations, as a percentage of total national income, have declined hugely. The President's budget would cut them to a level 48 percent below the 1980 level, and by 2012, to a level 57 percent below 1980. That's hardly runaway growth. That is a steady bleed of America's quality of life and America's future.

For the President to borrow $1.2 trillion to pay for tax cuts, and $600 billion to pay for Iraq, including another $140 billion next year, and then pretend that this modest 2 percent difference with him is the cause of fiscal irresponsibility is sheer nonsense, and many enlightened Republicans know it.

These investments are not just fiscally responsible, they are necessary for the future health and strength of the Nation.

One other point. We will today hear complaints about earmarks in this bill. Let us be clear, the last time Congress was in Democratic hands there were no earmarks in this bill. Under Republican rule, they exploded from zero to over 3,000.

This bill has cut back the dollar level for earmarks to half the level in the 2006 bill. Exactly two-tenths of 1 percent of the total funding in this bill go for congressionally directed earmarks.

And let me also point out that the amount of dollars in spending directed by the Congress is a tiny fraction of the amount directed by the Administration. First, for instance, the Administration in this bill requests specific earmarks, $10 million for Reach Out and Read, $10 million for Teach for America, $9 million for the Points of Light Foundation, $4.5 million for America's Promise, $1.7 million for the Mind and Body Institute, $1.4 million for the YMCA.

On top of that, in 2006 alone, the Health and Social Services Department directed spending of $1.9 billion through 21,000 contracts that were less than fully competed. That alone is more than seven times the amount of congressionally directed spending in this bill.

In the Labor Department, 90 percent of discretionary funding for the High Growth Job Training Program was spent on a noncompetitive basis.

The Office of Inspector General found that the Education Department strongarmed State and local school districts to select textbooks from favored publishers. Madison, Wisconsin, in my own State, lost its $2 million Reading First grant because they refused to purchase texts from an inferior program. Yet, the most thoroughly evaluated programs, like Success for All and Reading Recovery, were frozen out by the program administrators.

ABC reported that one publisher with good connections at the White House saw its corporate net worth rise from $5 million to $360 million, with a little help from their friends.

The Office of Inspector General has made criminal references to the Justice Department, and we have cut Reading First until the Administration changes its ways.

So I would simply say, Madam Chairman, spare us the Administration's sanctimony about earmarks or directed spending, and please spare us the pretense that this bill has anything to do

with the fiscal mess this country faces. It is a disciplined set of investments. Virtually every Republican amendment in committee did not seek to cut funding, rather it sought to increase it.

I appreciate the bipartisan support for the bill in committee. I appreciate the partnership with Mr. WALSH, the ranking member.

People who have reviewed it most closely, Republicans and Democrats alike, know this bill is responsible and disciplined.

Just one comparison. The Administration's defense request, even without counting the $140 billion in new money that they're asking for in their supplemental, that defense bill is still $43 billion above last year, which is at least four times as large as the difference between the committee and the Congress on this bill.

I would urge every Member who thinks about this country's future to support this bill.

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

		FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
100	TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF LABOR						100	
150	EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION						150	
200	TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES						200	
250	Grants to States:						250	
300	Adult Training, current year	152,199	---	152,199	---	+152,199	300	FF
350	Advance from prior year	(712,000)	(712,000)	(712,000)	---	---	350	
400	FY 2009	712,000	712,000	712,000	---	---	400	
450	Adult Training	864,199	712,000	864,199	---	+152,199	450	
500	Youth Training	940,500	840,500	940,500	---	+100,000	500	FF
550	Dislocated Worker Assistance, current year	341,811	54,939	341,811	---	+286,872	550	FF
600	Advance from prior year	(848,000)	(848,000)	(848,000)	---	---	600	
650	FY 2009	848,000	848,000	848,000	---	---	650	
700	Dislocated Worker Assistance	1,189,811	902,939	1,189,811	---	+286,872	700	
710	Subtotal, Grants to States	2,994,510	2,455,439	2,994,510	---	+539,071	710	
720	Current Year	(1,434,510)	(895,439)	(1,434,510)	---	(+539,071)	720	
730	FY 2009	(1,560,000)	(1,560,000)	(1,560,000)	---	---	730	
750	Federally Administered Programs:						750	
755	Dislocated Worker Assistance National Reserve:						755	
760	Current year	70,092	---	70,092	---	+70,092	760	FF
770	Advance from prior year 1/	(212,000)	(212,000)	(212,000)	---	---	770	
780	FY 2009	212,000	212,000	212,000	---	---	780	
790	Dislocated Worker Assistance Nat'l Reserve	282,092	212,000	282,092	---	+70,092	790	
792	Less Community-based Job Training Grants (NA)	(-125,000)	---	(-125,000)	---	(-125,000)	792	
793	Dislocated Worker Assistance Nat'l Reserve	157,092	212,000	157,092	---	-54,908	793	
794	Total, Dislocated Worker Assistance	1,471,903	1,114,939	1,471,903	---	+356,964	794	
800	Native Americans	53,696	45,000	56,381	+2,685	+11,381	800	FF
850	Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers	79,752	---	83,740	+3,988	+83,740	850	FF
855	Women in apprenticeship	1,000	---	1,000	---	+1,000	855	FF
875	YouthBuild	49,500	50,000	60,000	+10,500	+10,000	875	FF
900	Subtotal, Federally Administered Programs	466,040	307,000	483,213	+17,173	+176,213	900	
910	Current Year	(254,040)	(95,000)	(271,213)	(+17,173)	(+176,213)	910	
920	FY 2009	(212,000)	(212,000)	(212,000)	---	---	920	
1300	National Activities:						1300	
1350	Pilots, Demonstrations and Research	14,700	13,000	28,140	+13,440	+15,140	1350	FF
1399	Responsible Reintegration of Youthful						1399	FF
1400	Offenders 4/	49,104	---	---	-49,104	---	1400	FF
1410	Prisoner Re-entry 4/	19,642	---	---	-19,642	---	1410	
1420	Reintegration of Ex-Offenders 4/	---	39,600	68,746	+68,746	+29,146	1420	FF
1450	Evaluation	4,921	7,000	4,921	---	-2,079	1450	FF
1515	Community-based Job Training Grants	---	150,000	---	---	-150,000	1515	
1516	Community-based Job Training Grants (NA)5/	(125,000)	---	(125,000)	---	(+125,000)	1516	
1517	Subtotal, program level	125,000	150,000	125,000	---	-25,000	1517	
1525	Denali Commission	6,875	---	---	-6,875	---	1525	
1550	Other	480	---	---	-480	---	1550	FF
1600	Subtotal, National activities	95,722	209,600	101,807	+6,085	-107,793	1600	
2100	Total, Training and Employment Services	3,556,272	2,972,039	3,579,530	+23,258	+607,491	2100	UA
2150	Current Year	(1,784,272)	(1,200,039)	(1,807,530)	(+23,258)	(+607,491)	2150	UA
2200	FY 2009	(1,772,000)	(1,772,000)	(1,772,000)	---	---	2200	UA

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
2300 COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT FOR OLDER AMERICANS	483,611	350,000	530,900	+47,289	+180,900	2300	FF
2400 FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS AND ALLOWANCES	837,600	888,700	888,700	+51,100	---	2400	M UA
2600 STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT						2600	
2650 SERVICE OPERATIONS						2650	
2700 Unemployment Compensation:						2700	
2750 State Operations	2,497,770	2,550,723	2,550,723	+52,953	---	2750	
2850 National Activities	9,900	10,500	10,500	+600	---	2850	
2950 Subtotal, Unemployment Compensation	2,507,670	2,561,223	2,561,223	+53,553	---	2950	
3100 Employment Service:						3100	
3150 Allotments to States:						3150	
3200 Federal Funds	22,883	22,016	23,203	+320	+1,187	3200	
3250 Trust Funds	693,000	666,763	702,680	+9,680	+35,917	3250	
3300 Subtotal, Allotments to States	715,883	688,779	725,883	+10,000	+37,104	3300	
3350 ES National Activities	33,428	32,766	32,766	-662	---	3350	
3400 Subtotal, Employment Service	749,311	721,545	758,649	+9,338	+37,104	3400	
3450 Federal Funds	22,883	22,016	23,203	+320	+1,187	3450	
3500 Trust Funds	726,428	699,529	735,446	+9,018	+35,917	3500	
3550 One-Stop Career Centers/Labor Market Information	63,855	55,985	52,985	-10,870	-3,000	3550	
3600 Work Incentives Grants	19,514	---	9,757	-9,757	+9,757	3600	FF
3650 Total, State Unemployment & Employment Srvcs	3,340,350	3,338,753	3,382,614	+42,264	+43,861	3650	
3700 Federal Funds	106,252	78,001	85,945	-20,307	+7,944	3700	
3750 Trust Funds	(3,234,098)	(3,260,752)	(3,296,669)	(+62,571)	(+35,917)	3750	
3800 ADVANCES TO THE UI AND OTHER TRUST FUNDS 6/	465,000	437,000	437,000	-28,000	---	3800	M
3900 PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION						3900	
3950 Adult Employment and Training	43,442	45,593	43,442	---	-2,151	3950	
4000 Trust Funds	7,846	8,283	7,846	---	-437	4000	
4050 Youth Employment and Training 3/	39,354	40,311	10,981	-28,373	-29,330	4050	
4100 Employment Security	6,354	6,376	6,354	---	-22	4100	
4150 Trust Funds	72,113	84,436	72,113	---	-12,323	4150	
4200 Apprenticeship Services	21,542	21,725	21,542	---	-183	4200	
4250 Executive Direction 3/	6,967	7,250	6,132	-835	-1,118	4250	
4300 Trust Funds	2,090	2,188	2,090	---	-98	4300	
4400 Total, Program Administration	199,708	216,162	170,500	-29,208	-45,662	4400	
4450 Federal Funds	117,659	121,255	88,451	-29,208	-32,804	4450	
4500 Trust Funds	82,049	94,907	82,049	---	-12,858	4500	
4550 Total, Employment and Training Administration	8,882,541	8,202,654	8,989,244	+106,703	+786,590	4550	
4600 Federal Funds	5,566,394	4,846,995	5,610,526	+44,132	+763,531	4600	
4650 Current Year	(3,794,394)	(3,074,995)	(3,838,526)	(+44,132)	(+763,531)	4650	
4700 FY 2009	(1,772,000)	(1,772,000)	(1,772,000)	---	---	4700	
4750 Trust Funds	3,316,147	3,355,659	3,378,718	+62,571	+23,059	4750	
4800 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS SECURITY ADMINISTRATION						4800	
4805 SALARIES AND EXPENSES						4805	
4850 Enforcement and Participant Assistance	118,718	123,163	118,663	-55	-4,500	4850	
4900 Policy and Compliance Assistance	17,585	18,315	18,315	+730	---	4900	
4950 Executive Leadership, Program Oversight and Admin	5,270	5,947	5,947	+677	---	4950	
5000 Total, EBSA	141,573	147,425	142,925	+1,352	-4,500	5000	
5050 PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION						5050	
5060 Pension insurance activities	(80,357)	(74,784)	(74,784)	(-5,573)	---	5060	
5070 Pension plan termination	(128,466)	(205,158)	(205,158)	(+76,692)	---	5070	
5080 Operational support	(196,567)	(131,209)	(131,209)	(-65,358)	---	5080	
5250 Total, PBGC (Program level)	(405,390)	(411,151)	(411,151)	(+5,761)	---	5250	

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request	
5300 EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION						5300
5350 SALARIES AND EXPENSES						5350
5400 Enforcement of Wage and Hour Standards	170,220	182,365	182,365	+12,145	---	5400
5450 Office of Labor-Management Standards	47,753	56,888	45,737	-2,016	-11,151	5450
5500 Federal Contractor EEO Standards Enforcement	82,441	84,182	84,182	+1,741	---	5500
5550 Federal Programs for Workers' Compensation	100,889	104,478	104,478	+3,589	---	5550
5650 Trust Funds	2,042	2,111	2,111	+69	---	5650
5700 Program Direction and Support	17,526	17,635	17,635	+109	---	5700
5750 Total, ESA salaries and expenses	420,871	447,659	436,508	+15,637	-11,151	5750
5800 Federal Funds	418,829	445,548	434,397	+15,568	-11,151	5800
5850 Trust Funds	2,042	2,111	2,111	+69	---	5850
5900 SPECIAL BENEFITS						5900
5950 Federal employees' compensation benefits	224,000	200,000	200,000	-24,000	---	5950 M
6000 Longshore and harbor workers' benefits	3,000	3,000	3,000	---	---	6000 M
6050 Total, Special Benefits	227,000	203,000	203,000	-24,000	---	6050
6060 SPECIAL BENEFITS FOR DISABLED COAL MINERS						6060
6065 Benefit payments	298,000	271,000	271,000	-27,000	---	6065 M
6070 Administration	5,373	5,221	5,221	-152	---	6070 M
6075 Subtotal, FY 2008 program level	303,373	276,221	276,221	-27,152	---	6075
6080 Less funds advanced in prior year	-74,000	-68,000	-68,000	+6,000	---	6080 M
6085 Total, Current Year, FY 2008	229,373	208,221	208,221	-21,152	---	6085
6090 New advances, 1st quarter FY 2009	68,000	62,000	62,000	-6,000	---	6090 M
6095 Total, Special Benefits for Disabled Coal Miners	297,373	270,221	270,221	-27,152	---	6095
6200 ENERGY EMPLOYEES OCCUPATIONAL ILLNESS COMPENSATION						6200
6250 FUND, Part B Administrative Expenses	102,307	104,745	104,745	+2,438	---	6250 M
6350 BLACK LUNG DISABILITY TRUST FUND						6350
6400 Benefit payments and interest on advances	1,010,011	1,009,763	1,009,763	-248	---	6400 M
6450 Employment Standards Admin., Salaries and expenses	33,578	32,761	32,761	-817	---	6450 M
6500 Departmental Management, Salaries and expenses	25,255	24,785	24,785	-470	---	6500 M
6550 Departmental Management, Inspector General	346	335	335	-11	---	6550 M
6600 Subtotal, Black Lung Disability	1,069,190	1,067,644	1,067,644	-1,546	---	6600
6650 Treasury Department Administrative Costs	356	356	356	---	---	6650 M
6700 Total, Black Lung Disability Trust Fund	1,069,546	1,068,000	1,068,000	-1,546	---	6700
6750 Total, Employment Standards Administration	2,117,097	2,093,625	2,082,474	-34,623	-11,151	6750
6800 Federal Funds	2,115,055	2,091,514	2,080,363	-34,692	-11,151	6800
6810 Current year	(2,047,055)	(2,029,514)	(2,018,363)	(-28,692)	(-11,151)	6810
6820 FY 2009	(68,000)	(62,000)	(62,000)	(-6,000)	---	6820
6850 Trust Funds	2,042	2,111	2,111	+69	---	6850
6900 OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION						6900
6950 SALARIES AND EXPENSES						6950
7000 Safety and Health Standards	16,892	16,851	16,933	+41	+82	7000
7050 Federal Enforcement	176,973	183,046	190,128	+13,155	+7,082	7050
7100 State Programs	91,093	91,093	91,093	---	---	7100
7150 Technical Support	22,392	22,066	22,066	-326	---	7150
7200 Compliance Assistance:						7200
7250 Federal Assistance	72,659	79,607	75,566	+2,907	-4,041	7250
7300 State Consultation Grants	53,357	54,531	54,531	+1,174	---	7300
7350 Training Grants	10,116	---	10,116	---	+10,116	7350
7400 Subtotal, Compliance Assistance	136,132	134,138	140,213	+4,081	+6,075	7400
7450 Safety and Health Statistics	32,274	32,082	32,082	-192	---	7450
7500 Executive Direction and Administration	11,169	11,001	11,001	-168	---	7500
7550 Total, OSHA	486,925	490,277	503,516	+16,591	+13,239	7550

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

		FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
7600	MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION						7600	
7650	SALARIES AND EXPENSES						7650	
7700	Coal Enforcement	120,396	140,620	140,620	+20,224	---	7700	
7750	Metal/Non-Metal Enforcement	72,506	72,290	72,290	-216	---	7750	
7800	Standards Development	2,727	2,737	2,737	+10	---	7800	
7850	Assessments	6,556	5,743	5,743	-813	---	7850	
7900	Educational Policy and Development	35,326	34,256	34,256	-1,070	---	7900	
7950	Technical Support	29,237	28,200	28,200	-1,037	---	7950	
7975	Program evaluation and information resources (PEIR)	21,185	16,219	16,219	-4,966	---	7975	
8000	Program Administration	13,637	13,413	13,413	-224	---	8000	
8050	Total, Mine Safety and Health Administration	301,570	313,478	313,478	+11,908	---	8050	
8100	BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS						8100	
8150	SALARIES AND EXPENSES						8150	
8200	Employment and Unemployment Statistics	169,722	175,320	175,320	+5,598	---	8200	
8250	Labor Market Information	77,067	78,264	78,264	+1,197	---	8250	
8300	Prices and Cost of Living	177,847	192,149	192,599	+14,752	+450	8300	
8350	Compensation and Working Conditions	81,658	84,859	86,084	+4,426	+1,225	8350	
8400	Productivity and Technology	11,063	11,332	11,332	+269	---	8400	
8450	Executive Direction and Staff Services	30,766	32,519	32,519	+1,753	---	8450	
8500	Total, Bureau of Labor Statistics	548,123	574,443	576,118	+27,995	+1,675	8500	
8550	Federal Funds	471,056	496,179	497,854	+26,798	+1,675	8550	
8600	Trust Funds	77,067	78,264	78,264	+1,197	---	8600	
8650	OFFICE OF DISABILITY EMPLOYMENT POLICY						8650	
8700	Salaries and expenses	27,712	18,602	27,712	---	+9,110	8700	
8850	DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT						8850	
8900	SALARIES AND EXPENSES						8900	
8950	Executive Direction	28,189	28,680	23,237	-4,952	-5,443	8950	
9000	Departmental IT Crosscut	29,462	31,405	18,000	-11,462	-13,405	9000	
9050	Departmental Management Crosscut	1,108	750	500	-608	-250	9050	
9100	Legal Services	85,488	95,162	94,937	+9,449	-225	9100	
9150	Trust Funds	308	318	318	+10	---	9150	
9200	International Labor Affairs	72,516	14,097	72,516	---	+58,419	9200	
9250	Administration and Management	32,865	33,362	32,865	---	-497	9250	
9275	Frances Perkins building security enhancements	---	---	---	---	---	9275	
9300	Adjudication	27,537	28,289	28,289	+752	---	9300	
9350	Women's Bureau	9,666	9,832	10,500	+834	+668	9350	
9400	Civil Rights Activities	6,445	6,763	6,763	+318	---	9400	
9450	Chief Financial Officer	5,336	5,578	5,336	---	-242	9450	
9500	Total, Salaries and expenses	298,920	254,236	293,261	-5,659	+39,025	9500	
9550	Federal Funds	298,612	253,918	292,943	-5,669	+39,025	9550	
9560	Trust Funds	308	318	318	+10	---	9560	
9600	OFFICE OF JOB CORPS 2/						9600	
9610	Administration 3/	---	---	28,872	+28,872	+28,872	9610	
9620	Operations	879,357	831,372	916,684	+37,327	+85,312	9620	FF
9630	Advance from prior year	(591,000)	(591,000)	(591,000)	---	---	9630	
9640	FY 2009	591,000	591,000	591,000	---	---	9640	
9650	Construction and Renovation	7,920	---	12,920	+5,000	+12,920	9650	FF
9670	Advance from prior year	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	---	---	9670	
9680	FY 2009	100,000	100,000	100,000	---	---	9680	
9690	Total, Job Corps	1,578,277	1,522,372	1,649,476	+71,199	+127,104	9690	UA
9695	Current Year	(887,277)	(831,372)	(958,476)	(+71,199)	(+127,104)	9695	UA
9710	FY 2009	(691,000)	(691,000)	(691,000)	---	---	9710	UA
9880	VETERANS EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING						9880	
9890	State administration, Grants	160,791	161,894	161,894	+1,103	---	9890	
9900	Federal Administration	31,187	33,282	33,282	+2,095	---	9900	
9925	National Veterans' Training Institute	1,967	1,949	1,967	---	+18	9925	
9950	Homeless Veterans Program	21,809	23,620	23,620	+1,811	---	9950	
10000	Veterans Workforce Investment Programs	7,435	7,351	7,435	---	+84	10000	UA FF
10050	Total, Veterans Employment and Training	223,189	228,096	228,198	+5,009	+102	10050	
10100	Federal Funds	29,244	30,971	31,055	+1,811	+84	10100	
10150	Trust Funds	193,945	197,125	197,143	+3,198	+18	10150	

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
10200 OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL						10200	
10250 Program Activities	67,214	72,929	72,929	+5,715	---	10250	
10300 Trust Funds	5,552	5,729	5,729	+177	---	10300	
10400 Total, Office of the Inspector General	72,766	78,658	78,658	+5,892	---	10400	
10450 Federal funds	67,214	72,929	72,929	+5,715	---	10450	
10500 Trust funds	5,552	5,729	5,729	+177	---	10500	
10550 Total, Departmental Management	2,173,152	2,083,362	2,249,593	+76,441	+166,231	10550	
10600 Federal Funds	1,973,347	1,880,190	2,046,403	+73,056	+166,213	10600	
10610 Current Year	(1,482,152)	(1,392,362)	(1,558,593)	(+76,441)	(+166,231)	10610	
10620 FY 2009	(691,000)	(691,000)	(691,000)	---	---	10620	
10650 Trust Funds	199,805	203,172	203,190	+3,385	+18	10650	
10675 WORKING CAPITAL FUND						10675	
10680 Working capital fund	6,168	12,000	---	-6,168	-12,000	10680	
10700 Total, Title I, Department of Labor	14,684,861	13,935,866	14,885,060	+200,199	+949,194	10700	
10750 Federal Funds	11,089,800	10,296,660	11,222,777	+132,977	+926,117	10750	
10800 Current Year	(8,558,800)	(7,771,660)	(8,697,777)	(+138,977)	(+926,117)	10800	
10850 FY 2009	(2,531,000)	(2,525,000)	(2,525,000)	(-6,000)	---	10850	
10900 Trust Funds	3,595,061	3,639,206	3,662,283	+67,222	+23,077	10900	
10920 Title I Footnotes:						10920	
10922 1/ Includes FY 2006 rescission of $125M for						10922	
10923 Community College Initiative						10923	
10924 2/ In FY 2007, Job Corps was requested and funded in						10924	
10925 ETA; FY 2008 requested in ETA but funded in Dept Mgmt						10925	
10927 3/ Administration for Job Corps funding was						10927	
10928 transferred from ETA to DM in FY 2006 Act and FY 2008.						10928	
10930 4/ In FY 2008, the Responsible Reintegration of						10930	
10931 Youthful Offenders and Prisoner Re-entry programs will						10931	
10932 be combined into Reintegration of Ex-Offenders program						10932	
10937 5/ Funding from the Dislocated Worker National Reserve						10937	
10938 6/ Two year availability						10938	
10950 TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						10950	
11000 HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION						11000	
11050 HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES						11050	
11060 BUREAU OF PRIMARY HEALTH CARE						11060	
11100 Community health centers	1,988,039	1,988,467	2,188,000	+199,961	+199,533	11100	UA
11115 State health access grants	---	---	75,000	+75,000	+75,000	11115	
11125 Free Clinics Medical Malpractice	41	100	40	-1	-60	11125	
11134 National Hansen's Disease Program	15,972	16,109	16,109	+137	---	11134	
11136 Buildings and Facilities	220	100	100	-120	---	11136	
11138 Payment to Hawaii, treatment of Hansen's	1,996	1,976	1,996	---	+20	11138	
11142 Subtotal, Bureau of Primary Health Care	2,006,268	2,006,752	2,281,245	+274,977	+274,493	11142	
11149 BUREAU OF HEALTH PROFESSIONS						11149	
11150 National Health Service Corps:						11150	
11200 Field placements	40,443	30,729	40,443	---	+9,714	11200	
11250 Recruitment	85,230	85,230	91,057	+5,827	+5,827	11250	
11300 Subtotal, National Health Service Corps	125,673	115,959	131,500	+5,827	+15,541	11300	UA
11400 Health Professions, Training for Diversity:						11400	
11450 Centers of excellence	11,880	---	28,431	+16,551	+28,431	11450	
11500 Health careers opportunity program	3,960	---	28,440	+24,480	+28,440	11500	
11550 Faculty loan repayment	1,289	---	1,289	---	+1,289	11550	
11600 Scholarships for disadvantaged students	46,657	9,733	46,657	---	+36,924	11600	
11650 Subtotal, Training for Diversity	63,786	9,733	104,817	+41,031	+95,084	11650	
11700 Training in Primary Care Medicine and Dentistry	48,851	---	48,851	---	+48,851	11700	
11750 Interdisciplinary Community-Based Linkages:						11750	
11800 Area health education centers	28,681	---	31,200	+2,519	+31,200	11800	
11900 Allied health and other disciplines	3,960	---	3,960	---	+3,960	11900	
11950 Geriatric programs	31,548	---	31,548	---	+31,548	11950	
12050 Subtotal, Interdisciplinary Comm. Linkages	64,189	---	66,708	+2,519	+66,708	12050	
12200 Public health, preventive med. and dental programs	7,920	---	7,920	---	+7,920	12200	
12399 Nursing Programs:						12399	
12400 Advanced Education Nursing	57,061	---	57,061	---	+57,061	12400	
12450 Nurse education, practice, and retention	37,291	37,291	37,291	---	---	12450	
12500 Nursing workforce diversity	16,107	16,107	16,107	---	---	12500	

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

		FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
12505	Loan repayment and scholarship program	31,055	43,744	44,000	+12,945	+256	12505	
12515	Comprehensive geriatric education	3,392	3,392	3,392	---	---	12515	
12520	Nursing faculty loan program	4,773	4,773	7,773	+3,000	+3,000	12520	
12525	Subtotal, Nursing programs	149,679	105,307	165,624	+15,945	+60,317	12525	
12550	Subtotal, Health Professions	334,425	115,040	393,920	+59,495	+278,880	12550	UA
12600	Children's Hospitals Graduate Medical Education	297,009	110,018	307,009	+10,000	+196,991	12600	
12610	National Practitioner Data Bank	16,200	18,900	18,900	+2,700	---	12610	
12615	User Fees	-16,200	-18,900	-18,900	-2,700	---	12615	
12620	Health Care Integrity and Protection Data Bank	3,825	---	4,000	+175	+4,000	12620	
12625	User Fees	-3,825	---	-4,000	-175	-4,000	12625	
12630	Subtotal, Bureau of Health Professions	757,107	341,017	832,429	+75,322	+491,412	12630	
12745	MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH BUREAU						12745	
12750	Maternal and Child Health Block Grant	693,000	693,000	750,000	+57,000	+57,000	12750	
12775	Sickle cell anemia demonstration program	2,180	2,184	2,184	+4	---	12775	
12800	Traumatic Brain Injury	8,910	---	8,910	---	+8,910	12800	UA
12950	Healthy Start	101,518	100,503	120,000	+18,482	+19,497	12950	UA
13000	Universal Newborn Hearing	9,804	---	11,000	+1,196	+11,000	13000	UA
13005	Emergency medical services for children	19,800	---	19,800	---	+19,800	13005	UA
13015	Subtotal, Maternal and Child Health Bureau	835,212	795,687	911,894	+76,682	+116,207	13015	
13020	HIV/AIDS BUREAU						13020	
13025	Ryan White AIDS Programs:						13025	
13030	Emergency Assistance	603,993	603,993	636,300	+32,307	+32,307	13030	
13035	Comprehensive Care Programs	1,195,500	1,215,518	1,239,500	+44,000	+23,982	13035	
13040	AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP) (NA)	(789,546)	(814,546)	(830,593)	(+41,047)	(+16,047)	13040	
13045	Early Intervention Program	193,721	199,821	216,700	+22,979	+16,879	13045	
13050	Children, Youth, Women, and Families	71,794	71,794	71,800	+6	+6	13050	
13055	AIDS Dental Services	13,086	13,086	13,086	---	---	13055	
13060	Education and Training Centers	34,701	28,700	34,700	-1	+6,000	13060	
13065	Subtotal, Ryan White AIDS programs	2,112,795	2,132,912	2,212,086	+99,291	+79,174	13065	
13070	Evaluation Tap Funding (NA)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	---	---	13070	
13075	Subtotal, Ryan White AIDs program level	(2,137,795)	(2,157,912)	(2,237,086)	(+99,291)	(+79,174)	13075	
13110	Subtotal, HIV/AIDS Bureau	2,112,795	2,132,912	2,212,086	+99,291	+79,174	13110	
13200	HEALTHCARE SYSTEMS BUREAU						13200	
13205	Organ Transplantation	23,049	23,049	23,049	---	---	13205	UA
13210	National Cord Blood Inventory	3,963	1,966	3,963	---	+1,997	13210	
13215	Bone Marrow Program	25,168	22,701	25,168	---	+2,467	13215	
13220	Office of Pharmacy Affairs	---	2,940	2,940	+2,940	---	13220	
13225	Poison control	23,000	10,000	30,100	+7,100	+20,100	13225	
13230	Subtotal, Healthcare systems bureau	75,180	60,656	85,220	+10,040	+24,564	13230	
13300	RURAL HEALTH PROGRAMS						13300	
13305	Rural outreach grants	38,885	---	52,962	+14,077	+52,962	13305	UA
13310	Rural Health Research	8,737	8,737	9,500	+763	+763	13310	
13315	Rural Hospital Flexibility Grants	63,538	---	63,538	---	+63,538	13315	
13317	Delta Health Initiative 1/	---	---	---	---	---	13317	
13320	Rural and community access to emergency devices	1,487	---	2,000	+513	+2,000	13320	UA
13330	State Offices of Rural Health	8,141	8,141	9,000	+859	+859	13330	UA
13332	Black lung clinics 2/	5,891	5,886	5,891	---	+5	13332	
13333	Radiation Exposure Screening and Education Program 2/	1,919	1,904	1,917	-2	+13	13333	
13340	Subtotal, Rural health programs	128,598	24,668	144,808	+16,210	+120,140	13340	
14290	Denali Commission	39,283	---	---	-39,283	---	14290	UA
14300	Family Planning	283,146	283,103	310,910	+27,764	+27,807	14300	UA
14350	Health Care-related Facilities and activities	---	---	127,926	+127,926	+127,926	14350	
14450	Telehealth	6,819	6,819	7,000	+181	+181	14450	UA
14850	Program Management	146,294	144,191	142,191	-4,103	-2,000	14850	
14900	Total, Health resources and services	6,390,702	5,795,805	7,055,709	+665,007	+1,259,904	14900	
14910	Total, Health resources & services program level	(6,415,702)	(5,820,805)	(7,080,709)	(+665,007)	(+1,259,904)	14910	
14915	Evaluation tap funding	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	---	---	14915	

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
15050 HEALTH EDUCATION ASSISTANCE LOANS (HEAL) PROGRAM:						15050	
15100 Liquidating account	(4,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(-3,000)	---	15100	
15150 Program management	2,898	2,906	2,906	+8	---	15150	
15200 Total, HEAL	2,898	2,906	2,906	+8	---	15200	
15250 VACCINE INJURY COMPENSATION PROGRAM TRUST FUND:						15250	
15300 Post-FY 1988 claims	55,871	57,547	57,547	+1,676	---	15300	M
15350 HRSA administration	3,982	3,528	3,528	-454	---	15350	
15400 Total, Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund	59,853	61,075	61,075	+1,222	---	15400	
15450 Total, Health Resources and Services Admin.	6,453,453	5,859,786	7,119,690	+666,237	+1,259,904	15450	
15475 Total, HRSA program level	(6,482,453)	(5,885,786)	(7,145,690)	(+663,237)	(+1,259,904)	15475	
15500 CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION						15500	
15590 Infectious Diseases	1,791,437	1,781,574	1,900,508	+109,071	+118,934	15590	UA
15601 Evaluation Tap Funding	(12,794)	(12,794)	(12,794)	---	---	15601	
15602 Subtotal, Program level	(1,804,231)	(1,794,368)	(1,913,302)	(+109,071)	(+118,934)	15602	
15650 Health Promotion	959,662	958,732	1,002,212	+42,550	+43,480	15650	UA
15700 Health Information and Service	88,418	108,361	70,104	-18,314	-38,257	15700	UA
15701 Evaluation Tap Funding	(134,235)	(135,135)	(183,924)	(+49,689)	(+48,789)	15701	
15702 Subtotal, Program level	(222,653)	(243,496)	(254,028)	(+31,375)	(+10,532)	15702	
15750 Environmental health and injury	288,104	287,674	305,151	+17,047	+17,477	15750	UA
15800 Occupational safety and health 4/	167,028	165,927	222,576	+55,548	+56,649	15800	
15805 Supplemental (P.L. 110-28) (emergency)	63,000	---	---	-63,000	---	15805	
15810 Evaluation Tap Funding	(87,071)	(87,071)	(88,361)	(+1,290)	(+1,290)	15810	
15815 Subtotal, Program level 4/	(317,099)	(252,998)	(310,937)	(-6,162)	(+57,939)	15815	
15850 Global health	334,038	379,719	381,337	+47,299	+1,618	15850	
15870 Terrorism preparedness and response 3/	1,541,300	1,504,375	1,598,751	+57,451	+94,376	15870	
15900 Public Health research:						15900	
15910 Evaluation Tap Funding	(31,000)	(31,000)	(31,000)	---	---	15910	
15950 Public health improvement and leadership	189,808	190,412	199,237	+9,429	+8,825	15950	
16000 Preventive health and health services block grant	99,000	---	109,000	+10,000	+109,000	16000	UA
16030 Undistributed reduction	---	---	-2,000	-2,000	-2,000	16030	
16050 Buildings and Facilities	134,400	20,000	10,500	-123,900	-9,500	16050	
16150 Business services	344,377	319,877	344,377	---	+24,500	16150	
16395 Total, Centers for Disease Control	5,937,572	5,716,651	6,141,753	+204,181	+425,102	16395	
16420 Evaluation Tap Funding (NA)	(265,100)	(266,000)	(316,079)	(+50,979)	(+50,079)	16420	
16425 Total, Centers for Disease Control program level	(6,265,672)	(5,982,651)	(6,457,832)	(+192,160)	(+475,181)	16425	
16550 NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH						16550	
16600 National Cancer Institute	4,797,639	4,782,114	4,870,382	+72,743	+88,268	16600	
16650 National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute	2,922,929	2,925,413	2,965,775	+42,846	+40,362	16650	
16700 National Institute of Dental & Craniofacial Research	389,703	389,722	395,753	+6,050	+6,031	16700	
16740 National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and						16740	
16750 Kidney Diseases	1,705,868	1,708,045	1,731,893	+26,025	+23,848	16750	
16775 Juvenile diabetes (mandatory)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	---	---	16775	M
16780 Subtotal, NIDDK	(1,855,868)	(1,858,045)	(1,881,893)	(+26,025)	(+23,848)	16780	
16800 National Institute of Neurological Disorders & Stroke	1,535,545	1,537,019	1,559,106	+23,561	+22,087	16800	
16850 National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases	4,268,708	4,292,482	4,332,019	+63,311	+39,537	16850	
16900 Global HIV/AIDS Fund Transfer	99,000	300,000	300,000	+201,000	---	16900	
16950 Subtotal, NIAID	4,367,708	4,592,482	4,632,019	+264,311	+39,537	16950	
17000 National Institute of General Medical Sciences	1,935,808	1,941,462	1,966,019	+30,211	+24,557	17000	
17050 National Institute of Child Health & Human Development	1,254,707	1,264,946	1,273,863	+19,156	+8,917	17050	
17100 National Eye Institute	667,116	667,820	677,039	+9,923	+9,219	17100	
17150 National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences	642,002	637,406	652,303	+10,301	+14,897	17150	
17250 National Institute on Aging	1,047,260	1,047,148	1,062,833	+15,573	+15,685	17250	
17300 National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal						17300	
17350 and Skin Diseases	508,240	508,082	516,044	+7,804	+7,962	17350	
17400 National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication						17400	
17450 Disorders	393,668	393,682	400,305	+6,637	+6,623	17450	
17500 National Institute of Nursing Research	137,404	137,800	139,527	+2,123	+1,727	17500	
17550 National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism	436,259	436,505	442,870	+6,611	+6,365	17550	
17600 National Institute on Drug Abuse	1,000,621	1,000,365	1,015,559	+14,938	+15,194	17600	
17650 National Institute of Mental Health	1,404,494	1,405,421	1,425,531	+21,037	+20,110	17650	
17700 National Human Genome Research Institute	486,491	484,436	493,996	+7,505	+9,560	17700	
17750 National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and						17750	
17800 Bioengineering	296,887	300,463	303,318	+6,431	+2,855	17800	

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request	
17850 National Center for Research Resources	1,133,240	1,112,498	1,171,095	+37,855	+58,597	17850
17900 National Center for Complementary and Alternative						17900
17950 Medicine	121,576	121,699	123,380	+1,804	+1,681	17950
18000 National Center on Minority Health and Health						18000
18050 Disparities	199,444	194,495	202,691	+3,247	+8,196	18050
18100 John E. Fogarty International Center	66,446	66,594	67,599	+1,153	+1,005	18100
18150 National Library of Medicine	320,850	312,562	325,484	+4,634	+12,922	18150
18155 Evaluation Tap Funding	(8,200)	(8,200)	(8,200)	---	---	18155
18157 Subtotal, NLM	329,050	320,762	333,684	+4,634	+12,922	18157
18200 Office of the Director 3/	1,046,901	517,062	1,114,422	+67,521	+597,360	18200
18205 Common fund	(483,000)	(121,540)	(495,153)	(+12,153)	(+373,613)	18205
18250 Buildings and Facilities	81,081	136,000	121,081	+40,000	-14,919	18250
18400 Total, National Institutes of Health (NIH)	28,899,887	28,621,241	29,649,887	+750,000	+1,028,646	18400
18450 Global HIV/AIDS Fund Transfer	-99,000	-300,000	-300,000	-201,000	---	18450
18480 Evaluation Tap Funding	(8,200)	(8,200)	(8,200)	---	---	18480
18500 Total, NIH, Program Level	(28,809,087)	(28,329,441)	(29,358,087)	(+549,000)	(+1,028,646)	18500
18600 SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES						18600
18601 ADMINISTRATION (SAMHSA)						18601
18650 Mental Health:						18650
18700 Programs of Regional and National Significance	263,263	186,633	277,030	+13,767	+90,397	18700
18750 Mental Health block grant	406,843	406,843	419,843	+13,000	+13,000	18750
18775 Evaluation Tap Funding	(21,413)	(21,413)	(21,413)	---	---	18775
18780 Subtotal, Program level	(428,256)	(428,256)	(441,256)	(+13,000)	(+13,000)	18780
18800 Children's Mental Health	104,078	104,078	104,078	---	---	18800
18850 Grants to States for the Homeless (PATH)	54,261	54,261	54,261	---	---	18850
18900 Protection and Advocacy	34,000	34,000	34,000	---	---	18900
18950 Subtotal, Mental Health	862,445	785,815	889,212	+26,767	+103,397	18950
18955 Subtotal, Program level	(883,858)	(807,228)	(910,625)	(+26,767)	(+103,397)	18955
19000 Substance Abuse Treatment:						19000
19050 Programs of Regional and National Significance	394,649	347,790	398,102	+3,453	+50,312	19050
19075 Evaluation Tap Funding	(4,300)	(4,300)	(4,300)	---	---	19075
19080 Subtotal, Program level	(398,949)	(352,090)	(402,402)	(+3,453)	(+50,312)	19080
19100 Substance Abuse block grant	1,679,391	1,679,391	1,714,391	+35,000	+35,000	19100
19125 Evaluation Tap Funding	(79,200)	(79,200)	(79,200)	---	---	19125
19130 Subtotal, Program level	(1,758,591)	(1,758,591)	(1,793,591)	(+35,000)	(+35,000)	19130
19150 Subtotal, Substance Abuse Treatment	2,074,040	2,027,181	2,112,493	+38,453	+85,312	19150
19155 Subtotal, Program level	(2,157,540)	(2,110,681)	(2,195,993)	(+38,453)	(+85,312)	19155
19200 Substance Abuse Prevention:						19200
19250 Programs of Regional and National Significance	192,902	156,461	194,502	+1,600	+38,041	19250
19350 Program Management	76,721	76,969	76,721	---	-248	19350
19352 Evaluation Tap funding (NA)	(16,000)	(16,250)	(16,000)	---	(-250)	19352
19353 Subtotal, Program level	92,721	93,219	92,721	---	-498	19353
19400 Total, SAMHSA	3,206,108	3,046,426	3,272,928	+66,820	+226,502	19400 UA
19405 Evaluation Tap funding	(120,913)	(121,163)	(120,913)	---	(-250)	19405
19410 Total, SAMHSA program level	(3,327,021)	(3,167,589)	(3,393,841)	(+66,820)	(+226,252)	19410

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
19500 AGENCY FOR HEALTHCARE RESEARCH AND QUALITY						19500	
19550 Research on Health Costs, Quality, and Outcomes:						19550	
19600 Federal Funds	---	---	271,564	+271,564	+271,564	19600	
19650 Evaluation Tap funding (NA)	(260,986)	(271,564)	---	(-260,986)	(-271,564)	19650	
19700 Clinical effectiveness research (NA)	(15,000)	(15,000)	(30,000)	(+15,000)	(+15,000)	19700	
19750 Patient safety research (NA)	(84,000)	(93,934)	(78,934)	(-5,066)	(-15,000)	19750	
19800 Subtotal, Program level	(260,986)	(271,564)	(271,564)	(+10,578)	---	19800	
19850 Medical Expenditures Panel Surveys:						19850	
19900 Federal Funds	---	---	8,236	+8,236	+8,236	19900	
19950 Evaluation Tap funding (NA)	(55,300)	(55,300)	(47,064)	(-8,236)	(-8,236)	19950	
19960 Subtotal, Medical Expenditures Panel Surveys	(55,300)	(55,300)	(55,300)	---	---	19960	
20100 Program Support:						20100	
20125 Federal Funds	---	---	2,700	+2,700	+2,700	20125	
20150 Evaluation Tap funding (NA)	(2,700)	(2,700)	---	(-2,700)	(-2,700)	20150	
20160 Subtotal, Program support	(2,700)	(2,700)	(2,700)	---	---	20160	
20290 Total, AHRQ	---	---	282,500	+282,500	+282,500	20290	UA
20300 Evaluation Tap funding (NA)	(318,986)	(329,564)	(47,064)	(-271,922)	(-282,500)	20300	
20310 Total, AHRQ program level	(318,986)	(329,564)	(329,564)	(+10,578)	---	20310	
20350 Total, Public Health Service appropriation	44,560,020	43,244,104	46,466,758	+1,906,738	+3,222,654	20350	
20355 Total, Public Health Service program level	(45,203,219)	(43,695,031)	(46,685,014)	(+1,481,795)	(+2,989,983)	20355	
20500 CENTERS FOR MEDICARE AND MEDICAID SERVICES						20500	
20550 GRANTS TO STATES FOR MEDICAID						20550	
20600 Medicaid current law benefits	155,467,869	194,109,000	194,109,000	+38,641,131	---	20600	M
20650 State and local administration	9,881,583	10,014,716	10,014,716	+133,133	---	20650	M
20700 Vaccines for Children	2,905,330	2,761,957	2,763,957	-141,373	+2,000	20700	M
20750 Subtotal, Medicaid program level	168,254,782	206,885,673	206,887,673	+38,632,891	+2,000	20750	
20850 Less funds advanced in prior year	-62,783,825	-65,257,617	-65,257,617	-2,473,792	---	20850	M
20900 Total, Grants to States for medicaid	105,470,957	141,628,056	141,630,056	+36,159,099	+2,000	20900	
20950 New advance, 1st quarter	65,257,617	67,292,669	67,292,669	+2,035,052	---	20950	M
20990 State Children's Health Insurance program						20990	
20991 shortfall payment (SCHIP) (emergency)	396,000	---	---	-396,000	---	20991	
21000 PAYMENTS TO HEALTH CARE TRUST FUNDS						21000	
21050 Supplemental medical insurance	137,623,000	140,704,000	140,704,000	+3,081,000	---	21050	M
21100 Hospital insurance for the uninsured	239,000	269,000	269,000	+30,000	---	21100	M
21150 Federal uninsured payment	229,000	237,000	237,000	+8,000	---	21150	M
21200 Program management	175,000	192,000	192,000	+17,000	---	21200	M
21205 General revenue for Part D benefit	37,329,000	46,299,000	46,299,000	+8,970,000	---	21205	M
21210 General revenue for Part D administration	703,480	744,000	744,000	+40,520	---	21210	M
21220 HCFAC reimbursement	---	183,000	383,000	+383,000	+200,000	21220	M
21250 Subtotal, Payments to Trust Funds, current law	176,298,480	188,628,000	188,828,000	+12,529,520	+200,000	21250	
21260 Less funds advanced in prior year	---	---	---	---	---	21260	M
21280 Total, Payments to Trust Funds, current law	176,298,480	188,628,000	188,828,000	+12,529,520	+200,000	21280	
21300 PROGRAM MANAGEMENT 5/						21300	
21400 Research, Demonstration, Evaluation	57,420	33,700	23,070	-34,350	-10,630	21400	
21450 Medicare Operations 6/	2,159,242	2,303,615	2,221,215	+61,973	-82,400	21450	
21680 Revitalization plan	23,963	---	---	-23,963	---	21680	
21700 State Survey and Certification	258,128	293,524	293,524	+35,396	---	21700	
21750 High risk insurance pools	---	---	50,000	+50,000	+50,000	21750	
21800 Federal Administration 6/	642,354	643,187	642,354	---	-833	21800	
21950 Total, Program management, Limitation on new BA	3,141,107	3,274,026	3,230,163	+89,056	-43,863	21950	
21960 Survey and Certification user fee	---	(-35,000)	---	---	(+35,000)	21960	05
22000 Total, Program management, program level	(3,141,107)	(3,239,026)	(3,230,163)	(+89,056)	(-8,863)	22000	

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
22010 HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL						22010	
22015 Part D drug benefit/medicare advantage (MIP)	---	137,840	288,480	+288,480	+150,640	22015	
22017 HHS Office of Inspector General	---	17,530	36,690	+36,690	+19,160	22017	
22019 Department of Justice	---	17,530	36,690	+36,690	+19,160	22019	
22020 Medicaid and SCHIP financial management	---	10,100	21,140	+21,140	+11,040	22020	
22025 Total, Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control	---	183,000	383,000	+383,000	+200,000	22025	
22050 Total, Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services	350,564,161	401,005,751	401,363,888	+50,799,727	+358,137	22050	
22100 Federal funds	347,423,054	397,548,725	397,750,725	+50,327,671	+202,000	22100	
22150 Current year	(282,165,437)	(330,256,056)	(330,458,056)	(+48,292,619)	(+202,000)	22150	
22200 New advance, FY 2009	(65,257,617)	(67,292,669)	(67,292,669)	(+2,035,052)	---	22200	
22250 Trust Funds	3,141,107	3,457,026	3,613,163	+472,056	+156,137	22250	
22300 ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES						22300	
22350 FAMILY SUPPORT PAYMENTS TO STATES						22350	
22400 Payments to territories	38,000	38,000	38,000	---	---	22400	M
22450 Repatriation	1,000	1,000	1,000	---	---	22450	M
22500 Subtotal, Welfare payments	39,000	39,000	39,000	---	---	22500	
22550 Child Support Enforcement:						22550	
22600 State and local administration	3,943,678	3,417,713	3,417,713	-525,965	---	22600	M
22650 Federal incentive payments	471,000	483,000	483,000	+12,000	---	22650	M
22750 Access and visitation	10,000	10,000	10,000	---	---	22750	M
22800 Subtotal, Child Support Enforcement	4,424,678	3,910,713	3,910,713	-513,965	---	22800	
22850 Total, Family support payments program level	4,463,678	3,949,713	3,949,713	-513,965	---	22850	
22900 Less funds advanced in previous years	-1,200,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	+200,000	---	22900	M
22950 Total, Family support payments, current year	3,263,678	2,949,713	2,949,713	-313,965	---	22950	
23000 New advance, 1st quarter, FY 2009	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	---	---	23000	M
23020 LOW INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (LIHEAP)						23020	
23050 Formula grants	1,980,000	1,500,000	1,980,000	---	+480,000	23050	
23055 Deficit Reduction Act (P.L. 109-171) (NA)	---	---	---	---	---	23055	M
23080 Subtotal, Formula grants	1,980,000	1,500,000	1,980,000	---	+480,000	23080	UA
23150 Contingency fund	181,170	282,000	682,000	+500,830	+400,000	23150	
23152 Deficit Reduction Act (P.L. 109-171) (NA)	---	---	---	---	---	23152	M
23153 Subtotal, Contingency fund	181,170	282,000	682,000	+500,830	+400,000	23153	
23160 Total, LIHEAP	2,161,170	1,782,000	2,662,000	+500,830	+880,000	23160	
23175 Total, LIHEAP, program level	2,161,170	1,782,000	2,662,000	+500,830	+880,000	23175	
23200 REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE						23200	
23250 Transitional and Medical Services	265,546	294,021	294,021	+28,475	---	23250	UA
23300 Victims of Trafficking	9,823	14,816	9,814	-9	-5,002	23300	UA
23350 Social Services	154,005	149,610	154,005	---	+4,395	23350	UA
23400 Preventive Health	4,748	4,700	4,748	---	+48	23400	UA
23450 Targeted Assistance	48,590	48,104	48,590	---	+486	23450	UA
23475 Unaccompanied minors	95,318	134,662	129,635	+34,317	-5,027	23475	
23500 Victims of Torture	9,817	9,717	9,817	---	+100	23500	UA
23540 Total, Refugee and entrant assistance	587,847	655,630	650,630	+62,783	-5,000	23540	
23550 Total, Refugee and entrant assistance	587,847	655,630	650,630	+62,783	-5,000	23550	
23650 CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT	2,062,081	2,062,081	2,137,081	+75,000	+75,000	23650	UA
23700 SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANT (TITLE XX)	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	---	---	23700	M
23750 CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SERVICES PROGRAMS						23750	
23800 Programs for Children, Youth and Families:						23800	
23850 Head Start, current funded	5,499,771	5,399,771	5,574,771	+75,000	+175,000	23850	
23900 Advance from prior year	(1,388,800)	(1,388,800)	(1,388,800)	---	---	23900	
23950 FY 2009	1,388,800	1,388,800	1,388,800	---	---	23950	
24000 Subtotal, Head Start, program level	6,888,571	6,788,571	6,963,571	+75,000	+175,000	24000	UA
24050 Consolidated Runaway, Homeless Youth Program	87,837	87,837	97,837	+10,000	+10,000	24050	
24125 Prevention grants to reduce abuse of runaway youth	15,027	15,027	15,027	---	---	24125	

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

		FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
24150	Child Abuse State Grants	27,007	27,007	27,007	---	---	24150	
24200	Child Abuse Discretionary Activities	25,780	36,138	36,833	+11,053	+695	24200	
24225	Community based child abuse prevention	42,430	42,430	42,430	---	---	24225	
24250	Abandoned Infants Assistance	11,835	11,835	11,835	---	---	24250	
24300	Child Welfare Services	286,754	286,754	286,754	---	---	24300	
24350	Child Welfare Training	7,335	7,335	7,335	---	---	24350	
24400	Adoption Opportunities	26,848	26,848	26,848	---	---	24400	
24500	Adoption Incentive	5,000	13,500	9,500	+4,500	-4,000	24500	
24550	Adoption Awareness	12,674	12,674	14,674	+2,000	+2,000	24550	UA
24575	Interstate Home Study for Adoption and Foster Care	---	10,000	---	---	-10,000	24575	
24600	Compassion Capital Fund	64,350	75,000	64,350	---	-10,650	24600	
24650	Social Services and Income Maintenance Research	5,868	---	8,635	+2,767	+8,635	24650	
24655	Evaluation tap funding	(6,000)	(5,880)	(6,000)	---	(+120)	24655	
24657	Subtotal, Program level	(11,868)	(5,880)	(14,635)	(+2,767)	(+8,755)	24657	
24750	Developmental Disabilities Programs:						24750	
24800	State Councils	71,771	71,771	76,771	+5,000	+5,000	24800	
24850	Protection and Advocacy	38,718	38,718	38,718	---	---	24850	
24875	Voting access for individuals with disabilities	15,720	15,720	15,720	---	---	24875	
24899	Developmental Disabilities Projects of National						24899	
24900	Significance	11,414	11,414	11,414	---	---	24900	
24949	University Centers for Excellence in Developmental						24949	
24950	Disabilities	33,212	33,213	33,213	+1	---	24950	
25000	Subtotal, Developmental disabilities programs	170,835	170,836	175,836	+5,001	+5,000	25000	UA
25050	Native American Programs	44,332	44,332	47,332	+3,000	+3,000	25050	UA
25100	Community Services:						25100	
25150	Grants to States for Community Services	630,425	---	660,425	+30,000	+660,425	25150	UA
25200	Community Initiative Program:						25200	
25250	Economic Development	27,022	---	32,700	+5,678	+32,700	25250	UA
25275	Job Opportunities for Low-Income Individuals	5,382	---	5,382	---	+5,382	25275	
25300	Individual Development Account Initiative	24,452	24,452	24,452	---	---	25300	UA
25350	Rural Community Facilities	7,293	---	8,000	+707	+8,000	25350	UA
25400	Subtotal, Community Initiative Program	64,149	24,452	70,534	+6,385	+46,082	25400	
25550	Subtotal, Community Services	694,574	24,452	730,959	+36,385	+706,507	25550	
25650	Domestic Violence Hotline	2,970	2,970	2,970	---	---	25650	
25700	Family Violence/Battered Women's Shelters	124,731	124,731	134,731	+10,000	+10,000	25700	
25900	Mentoring Children of Prisoners	49,493	50,000	49,493	---	-507	25900	
25950	Independent Living Training Vouchers	46,157	46,157	46,157	---	---	25950	
25980	Abstinence Education	108,900	136,664	136,664	+27,764	---	25980	
25990	Evaluation Tap Funding	(4,500)	(4,500)	(4,500)	---	---	25990	
25995	Subtotal, Program level	(113,400)	(141,164)	(141,164)	(+27,764)	---	25995	
25997	Faith-Based Center	1,386	1,386	1,386	---	---	25997	
26000	Program Direction	187,776	197,225	187,776	---	-9,449	26000	
26050	Total, Children and Families Services Programs	8,938,470	8,239,709	9,125,940	+187,470	+886,231	26050	
26100	Current Year	(7,549,670)	(6,850,909)	(7,737,140)	(+187,470)	(+886,231)	26100	
26150	FY 2009	(1,388,800)	(1,388,800)	(1,388,800)	---	---	26150	
26160	Evaluation Tap funding	(10,500)	(10,380)	(10,500)	---	(+120)	26160	
26180	Total, Program level	8,948,970	8,250,089	9,136,440	+187,470	+886,351	26180	
26250	PROMOTING SAFE AND STABLE FAMILIES 7/	345,000	345,000	345,000	---	---	26250	M
26300	Discretionary Funds	89,100	89,100	89,100	---	---	26300	

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

		FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
26350	PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR FOSTER CARE AND ADOPTION						26350	
26400	Foster Care	4,475,000	4,593,000	4,593,000	+118,000	---	26400	M
26450	Adoption Assistance	2,027,000	2,159,000	2,159,000	+132,000	---	26450	M
26500	Independent living	140,000	140,000	140,000	---	---	26500	M
26550	Total, Payments to States	6,642,000	6,892,000	6,892,000	+250,000	---	26550	
26600	Less Advances from Prior Year	-1,730,000	-1,810,000	-1,810,000	-80,000	---	26600	M
26650	Total, payments, current year	4,912,000	5,082,000	5,082,000	+170,000	---	26650	
26700	New Advance, 1st quarter	1,810,000	1,776,000	1,776,000	-34,000	---	26700	M
26750	Total, Administration for Children & Families	26,869,346	25,681,233	27,517,464	+648,118	+1,836,231	26750	
26800	Current year	(22,670,546)	(21,516,433)	(23,352,664)	(+682,118)	(+1,836,231)	26800	
26850	FY 2009	(4,198,800)	(4,164,800)	(4,164,800)	(-34,000)	---	26850	
26875	Evaluation Tap funding	(10,500)	(10,380)	(10,500)	---	(+120)	26875	
26880	Total, Administration for Children & Families	26,879,846	25,691,613	27,527,964	+648,118	+1,836,351	26880	
26900	ADMINISTRATION ON AGING						26900	
26950	Grants to States:						26950	
27000	Supportive Services and Centers	350,595	350,595	357,595	+7,000	+7,000	27000	
27050	Preventive Health	21,400	---	21,400	---	+21,400	27050	
27100	Protection of Vulnerable Older Americans-Title VII	20,156	19,166	20,156	---	+990	27100	
27150	Family Caregivers	156,167	154,187	156,167	---	+1,980	27150	
27200	Native American Caregivers Support	6,241	6,241	6,428	+187	+187	27200	
27250	Subtotal, Caregivers	162,408	160,428	162,595	+187	+2,167	27250	
27300	Nutrition:						27300	
27350	Congregate Meals	398,919	383,401	411,692	+12,773	+28,291	27350	
27400	Home Delivered Meals	188,305	180,998	194,337	+6,032	+13,339	27400	
27425	Nutrition Services Incentive Program	147,846	147,110	152,570	+4,724	+5,460	27425	
27430	Subtotal, Nutrition	735,070	711,509	758,599	+23,529	+47,090	27430	
27440	Subtotal, Grants to States	1,289,629	1,241,698	1,320,345	+30,716	+78,647	27440	
27450	Grants for Native Americans	26,134	26,134	26,918	+784	+784	27450	
27500	Program Innovations	24,058	35,485	10,240	-13,818	-25,245	27500	
27550	Aging Network Support Activities	13,133	13,133	29,633	+16,500	+16,500	27550	
27600	Alzheimer's Disease Demonstrations	11,668	---	11,668	---	+11,668	27600	UA
27650	Program Administration	18,385	18,696	18,385	---	-311	27650	
27700	Total, Administration on Aging	1,383,007	1,335,146	1,417,189	+34,182	+82,043	27700	
27750	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY						27750	
27800	GENERAL DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT:						27800	
27850	Federal Funds	179,175	225,442	195,021	+15,846	-30,421	27850	
27855	Rescission (P.L. 110-28)	-500	---	---	+500	---	27855	
27950	Trust Funds	5,792	5,851	5,851	+59	---	27950	
28050	Subtotal	184,467	231,293	200,872	+16,405	-30,421	28050	
28100	Adolescent Family Life (Title XX)	30,307	30,307	30,307	---	---	28100	UA
28200	Minority health	53,455	43,775	49,284	-4,171	+5,509	28200	
28250	Office of women's health	28,246	27,369	28,800	+554	+1,431	28250	

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request	
28500 Minority HIV/AIDS	51,891	51,891	51,891	---	---	28500
28530 Afghanistan	5,892	5,941	5,941	+49	---	28530
28540 Embryo adoption awareness campaign	1,980	1,980	1,980	---	---	28540
28560 Evaluation tap funding (ASPE) (NA)	(39,552)	(46,756)	(46,756)	(+7,204)	---	28560
28600 Total, General Departmental Management	356,238	392,556	369,075	+12,837	-23,481	28600
28650 Federal Funds	(350,946)	(386,705)	(363,224)	(+12,278)	(-23,481)	28650
28655 Rescissions	(-500)	---	---	(+500)	---	28655
28700 Trust Funds	5,792	5,851	5,851	+59	---	28700
28775 Evaluation tap funding	(39,552)	(46,756)	(46,756)	(+7,204)	---	28775
28777 OFFICE OF MEDICARE HEARINGS AND APPEALS	59,727	70,000	65,000	+5,273	-5,000	28777
28779 OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL COORDINATOR FOR HEALTH						28779
28780 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY 8/	42,402	89,872	13,302	-29,100	-76,570	28780
28782 Evaluation tap funding	(18,900)	(28,000)	(48,000)	(+29,100)	(+20,000)	28782
28783 Total, Health Information Tech. program level	(61,302)	(117,872)	(61,302)	---	(-56,570)	28783
28850 OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL:						28850
28900 Federal Funds	39,808	44,687	44,687	+4,879	---	28900
28950 HIPAA funding (NA)	(175,570)	(196,418)	(196,418)	(+20,848)	---	28950
28975 Medicaid integrity program						28975
28976 Deficit Reduction Act (P.L. 109-171) (NA)	---	(25,000)	(25,000)	(+25,000)	---	28976
29050 Total, Inspector General program level	(215,378)	(266,105)	(266,105)	(+50,727)	---	29050
29100 OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS:						29100
29150 Federal Funds	31,628	33,748	33,748	+2,120	---	29150
29200 Trust Funds	3,281	3,314	3,314	+33	---	29200
29250 Total, Office for Civil Rights	34,909	37,062	37,062	+2,153	---	29250
29450 MEDICAL BENEFITS FOR COMMISSIONED OFFICERS						29450
29500 Retirement payments	292,249	317,967	317,967	+25,718	---	29500 M
29550 Survivors benefits	17,338	18,026	18,026	+688	---	29550 M
29600 Dependents' medical care	61,111	66,549	66,549	+5,438	---	29600 M
29605 Total,Medical benefits for Commissioned Officers	370,698	402,542	402,542	+31,844	---	29605
29750 PUBLIC HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICE EMERGENCY FUND						29750
29790 Office of the Secretary activities	717,320	780,646	757,291	+39,971	-23,355	29790
29800 Other PHSSEF activities	---	25,000	---	---	-25,000	29800
29806 Pandemic influenza preparedness	---	948,091	948,091	+948,091	---	29806
29850 Total, PHSSEF	717,320	1,753,737	1,705,382	+988,062	-48,355	29850
29860 Covered countermeasure process fund	---	---	5,000	+5,000	+5,000	29860
29900 Total, Office of the Secretary	1,621,102	2,790,456	2,642,050	+1,020,948	-148,406	29900
29950 Federal Funds	1,552,302	2,711,291	2,567,885	+1,015,583	-143,406	29950
30000 Trust Funds	68,800	79,165	74,165	+5,365	-5,000	30000
30100 Total, Title II, Dept of Health & Human Services	424,997,636	474,056,690	479,407,349	+54,409,713	+5,350,659	30100
30150 Federal Funds	421,787,729	470,520,499	475,720,021	+53,932,292	+5,199,522	30150
30200 Current year	(352,331,312)	(399,063,030)	(404,262,552)	(+51,931,240)	(+5,199,522)	30200
30210 Emergency appropriations	(459,000)	---	---	(-459,000)	---	30210
30250 FY 2009	(69,456,417)	(71,457,469)	(71,457,469)	(+2,001,052)	---	30250
30300 Trust Funds	3,209,907	3,536,191	3,687,328	+477,421	+151,137	30300

30305 Title II Footnotes: 30305
30308 1/In FY 2006, the Delta Health initiative funded 30308
30309 through the Rural hospital flexibility grant program 30309
30310 2/ Depart. of Health & Human Services reorganization 30310
30311 (7/12/06) of the Office of Rural Health Policy 30311
30312 3/ Funds provided for biodefense activities are 30312
30313 reflected within CDC and NIH respectively. 30313
30315 4/ Includes Mine Safety and Health. 30315
30318 5/ The Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 provided $74M 30318
30321 for CMS Program Management. 30321
30324 6/ FY 2006 Appropriations Act included a $60M program 30324
30325 administrative reduction. 30325
30327 7/ The Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 provided $20M for 30327
30328 the Promoting Safe and Stable Entitlement Program. 30328
30330 8/ An additional $50 million for Health IT within AHRQ 30330
30331 in FY 2007; an additional $45 million in FY 2008. 30331

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
30350 TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						30350	
30400 EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED						30400	
30450 Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)						30450	
30500 Basic Grants:						30500	
30550 Advance from prior year	(1,478,584)	(1,353,584)	(1,353,584)	(-125,000)	---	30550	
30600 Forward funded	5,451,387	5,325,824	5,451,387	---	+125,563	30600	FF
30650 Current funded	3,437	4,000	4,000	+563	---	30650	
30700 Subtotal, Basic grants current year approp.	5,454,824	5,329,824	5,455,387	+563	+125,563	30700	
30750 Subtotal, Basic grants total funds available	(6,933,408)	(6,683,408)	(6,808,971)	(-124,437)	(+125,563)	30750	
30800 Basic Grants FY 2009 Advance	1,353,584	1,478,584	1,353,584	---	-125,000	30800	
30850 Subtotal, Basic grants, program level	6,808,408	6,808,408	6,808,971	+563	+563	30850	
30900 Concentration Grants:						30900	
30950 Advance from prior year	(1,365,031)	(1,365,031)	(1,365,031)	---	---	30950	
31000 FY 2009 Advance	1,365,031	1,365,031	1,365,031	---	---	31000	
31050 Subtotal, Concentration Grants program level	1,365,031	1,365,031	1,365,031	---	---	31050	
31100 Targeted Grants:						31100	
31120 Forward funded	---	1,196,775	771,219	+771,219	-425,556	31120	FF
31150 Advance from prior year	(2,269,843)	(2,332,343)	(2,332,343)	(+62,500)	---	31150	
31200 FY 2009 Advance	2,332,343	2,269,843	2,323,343	-9,000	+53,500	31200	
31250 Subtotal, Targeted Grants program level	2,332,343	3,466,618	3,094,562	+762,219	-372,056	31250	
31300 Education Finance Incentive Grants:						31300	
31350 Advance from prior year	(2,269,843)	(2,332,343)	(2,332,343)	(+62,500)	---	31350	
31400 FY 2009 Advance	2,332,343	2,269,843	3,094,260	+761,917	+824,417	31400	
31450 Subtotal, Education Finance Incentive Grants	2,332,343	2,269,843	3,094,260	+761,917	+824,417	31450	
31500 Subtotal, Grants to LEAs, program level	12,838,125	13,909,900	14,362,824	+1,524,699	+452,924	31500	
31550 Even Start	82,283	---	99,000	+16,717	+99,000	31550	FF
31560 School improvement grants	125,000	500,000	500,000	+375,000	---	31560	FF
31600 Reading First:						31600	
31655 State Grants (forward funded)	1,029,234	1,018,692	400,000	-629,234	-618,692	31655	FF
31850 Subtotal, Reading First State Grants	1,029,234	1,018,692	400,000	-629,234	-618,692	31850	
31890 Early Reading First	117,666	117,666	114,550	-3,116	-3,116	31890	
31895 Striving readers 1/	31,870	100,000	31,870	---	-68,130	31895	FF
31897 Math Now for elementary school students	---	125,000	---	---	-125,000	31897	
31899 Math Now for middle school students	---	125,000	---	---	-125,000	31899	
31900 Literacy through School Libraries	19,485	19,486	19,486	+1	---	31900	
31915 Promise scholarships	---	250,000	---	---	-250,000	31915	
31920 America's opportunity scholarships for kids	---	50,000	---	---	-50,000	31920	
31950 State Agency Programs:						31950	
32000 Migrant	386,524	380,295	393,900	+7,376	+13,605	32000	FF
32050 Neglected and Delinquent/High Risk Youth	49,797	49,797	49,797	---	---	32050	FF
32060 Subtotal, State Agency programs	436,321	430,092	443,697	+7,376	+13,605	32060	
32100 Evaluation	9,330	9,327	9,330	---	+3	32100	
32150 Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration	2,352	---	1,634	-718	+1,634	32150	FF
32400 Migrant Education:						32400	
32450 High School Equivalency Program	18,550	18,550	18,550	---	---	32450	
32500 College Assistance Migrant Program	15,377	15,377	15,377	---	---	32500	
32550 Subtotal, Migrant Education	33,927	33,927	33,927	---	---	32550	UA
32600 Total, Education for the disadvantaged	14,725,593	16,689,090	16,016,318	+1,290,725	-672,772	32600	
32650 Current Year	(7,342,292)	(9,305,789)	(7,880,100)	(+537,808)	(-1,425,689)	32650	
32700 FY 2009	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(8,136,218)	(+752,917)	(+752,917)	32700	
32750 Subtotal, forward funded	(7,158,447)	(8,571,383)	(7,698,807)	(+540,360)	(-872,576)	32750	
32800 IMPACT AID						32800	
32850 Basic Support Payments	1,091,867	1,091,867	1,140,517	+48,650	+48,650	32850	
32900 Payments for Children with Disabilities	49,466	49,466	49,466	---	---	32900	
32950 Facilities Maintenance (Sec. 8008)	4,950	4,597	4,950	---	+353	32950	

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
33000 Construction (Sec. 8007)	17,820	17,820	17,820	---	---	33000	
33050 Payments for Federal Property (Sec. 8002)	64,350	64,350	65,700	+1,350	+1,350	33050	
33100 Total, Impact aid	1,228,453	1,228,100	1,278,453	+50,000	+50,353	33100	
33150 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS						33150	
33200 State Grants for Improving Teacher Quality	1,452,439	1,352,488	1,752,439	+300,000	+399,951	33200	FF
33250 Advance from prior year	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	---	---	33250	
33300 FY 2009	1,435,000	1,435,000	1,435,000	---	---	33300	
33350 Subtotal, State Grants for Improving Teacher						33350	
33400 Quality, program level	2,887,439	2,787,488	3,187,439	+300,000	+399,951	33400	
33600 Early Childhood Educator Professional Development	14,550	---	---	-14,550	---	33600	
33700 Mathematics and Science Partnerships	182,160	182,124	182,160	---	+36	33700	FF
33890 State Grants for Innovative Education (Education Block						33890	
33900 Grant)	99,000	---	99,000	---	+99,000	33900	FF
34150 Educational Technology State Grants	272,250	---	272,250	---	+272,250	34150	FF
34200 Supplemental Education Grants	18,001	18,001	18,001	---	---	34200	
34325 21st Century Community Learning Centers	981,166	981,180	1,106,166	+125,000	+124,986	34325	FF
35050 State Assessments/Enhanced Assessment Instruments	407,563	411,630	411,630	+4,067	---	35050	FF
35060 Javits gifted and talented education	7,596	---	7,596	---	+7,596	35060	
35070 Foreign language assistance	23,780	23,755	26,780	+3,000	+3,025	35070	
35100 Education for Homeless Children and Youth	61,871	61,878	66,878	+5,007	+5,000	35100	FF
35150 Training and Advisory Services (Civil Rights)	7,113	7,113	7,113	---	---	35150	
35200 Education for Native Hawaiians	33,907	---	33,907	---	+33,907	35200	
35250 Alaska Native Education Equity	33,907	---	33,907	---	+33,907	35250	
35300 Rural Education	168,918	168,851	168,918	---	+67	35300	FF
35400 Comprehensive Centers	56,257	56,256	56,257	---	+1	35400	
35900 Total, School improvement programs	5,255,478	4,698,276	5,678,002	+422,524	+979,726	35900	
35950 Current Year	(3,820,478)	(3,263,276)	(4,243,002)	(+422,524)	(+979,726)	35950	
36000 FY 2009	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	---	---	36000	
36050 Subtotal, forward funded	(3,625,367)	(3,158,151)	(4,059,441)	(+434,074)	(+901,290)	36050	
36100 INDIAN EDUCATION						36100	
36110 Grants to Local Educational Agencies	95,331	95,331	100,057	+4,726	+4,726	36110	
36120 Federal Programs:						36120	
36130 Special Programs for Indian Children	19,399	19,399	19,884	+485	+485	36130	
36140 National Activities	3,960	3,953	4,059	+99	+106	36140	
36150 Subtotal, Federal Programs	23,359	23,352	23,943	+584	+591	36150	
36170 Total, Indian Education	118,690	118,683	124,000	+5,310	+5,317	36170	
36300 INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT						36300	
36310 Troops-to-Teachers	14,645	14,645	14,645	---	---	36310	
36320 Transition to Teaching	44,484	44,482	44,484	---	+2	36320	
36330 Writing instruction	21,533	---	23,533	+2,000	+23,533	36330	
36340 Teaching of Traditional American History	119,790	50,000	119,790	---	+69,790	36340	
36350 School Leadership	14,731	---	14,731	---	+14,731	36350	
36360 Advanced Credentialing	16,695	---	10,695	-6,000	+10,695	36360	
36365 Adjunct Teacher Corps	---	25,000	---	---	-25,000	36365	
36370 Charter Schools Grants	214,783	214,782	251,394	+36,611	+36,612	36370	
36380 Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities	36,611	36,611	---	-36,611	-36,611	36380	UA
36390 Voluntary Public School Choice	26,278	26,275	26,278	---	+3	36390	
36400 Magnet Schools Assistance	106,693	106,685	106,693	---	+8	36400	
36425 Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE)	158,508	58,108	205,402	+46,894	+147,294	36425	
36433 Teacher Incentive Fund, Current funded	200	199,000	99,000	+98,800	-100,000	36433	
36440 Ready-to-Learn television	24,255	24,255	24,255	---	---	36440	
36460 Congressional Fellowships	1,454	---	1,454	---	+1,454	36460	
36470 Advanced Placement	37,026	122,175	50,000	+12,974	-72,175	36470	
36480 Total, Innovation and Improvement	837,686	922,018	992,354	+154,668	+70,336	36480	
36500 SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION						36500	
36510 Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities:						36510	
36520 State Grants, forward funded	346,500	100,000	300,000	-46,500	+200,000	36520	FF
36570 National Programs	141,112	200,000	141,112	---	-58,888	36570	
36575 Supplemental (P.L. 110-28) (emergency)	8,594	---	---	-8,594	---	36575	
36590 Alcohol Abuse Reduction	32,409	---	32,409	---	+32,409	36590	

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
36600 Mentoring Programs	48,814	---	48,814	---	+48,814	36600	
36610 Character education	24,248	24,248	24,248	---	---	36610	
36620 Elementary and Secondary School Counseling	34,650	---	61,500	+26,850	+61,500	36620	
36630 Carol M. White Physical Education Program	72,674	---	72,674	---	+72,674	36630	
36640 Civic Education	29,111	---	33,318	+4,207	+33,318	36640	
36670 Total, Safe Schools and Citizenship Education	738,112	324,248	714,075	-24,037	+389,827	36670	
36681 Current Year	(738,112)	(324,248)	(714,075)	(-24,037)	(+389,827)	36681	
36695 Subtotal, Forward funded	(346,500)	(100,000)	(300,000)	(-46,500)	(+200,000)	36695	
36700 ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION						36700	
36710 Current funded	43,485	43,603	50,350	+6,865	+6,747	36710	
36750 Forward funded	625,522	627,216	724,264	+98,742	+97,048	36750	FF
36800 Total, English Language Acquisition	669,007	670,819	774,614	+105,607	+103,795	36800	
36850 SPECIAL EDUCATION						36850	
36900 State Grants:						36900	
36950 Grants to States Part B current year	5,358,761	4,276,741	4,650,443	-708,318	+373,702	36950	FF
37000 Part B advance from prior year	(5,424,200)	(5,424,200)	(5,424,200)	---	---	37000	
37050 Grants to States Part B (FY 2009)	5,424,200	6,215,200	6,641,982	+1,217,782	+426,782	37050	
37100 Subtotal, Grants to States, program level	10,782,961	10,491,941	11,292,425	+509,464	+800,484	37100	
37150 Preschool Grants	380,751	380,751	380,751	---	---	37150	FF
37200 Grants for Infants and Families	436,400	423,067	436,400	---	+13,333	37200	FF
37250 Subtotal, State grants, program level	11,600,112	11,295,759	12,109,576	+509,464	+813,817	37250	
37300 IDEA National Activities (current funded):						37300	
37450 Technical Assistance and Dissemination	48,903	48,902	48,903	---	+1	37450	
37500 Personnel Preparation	89,720	89,719	89,720	---	+1	37500	
37550 Parent Information Centers	25,704	25,704	25,704	---	---	37550	
37600 Technology and Media Services	38,428	25,063	36,928	-1,500	+11,865	37600	
37700 Subtotal, IDEA special programs	202,755	189,388	201,255	-1,500	+11,867	37700	
37750 Total, Special education	11,802,867	11,485,147	12,310,831	+507,964	+825,684	37750	
37800 Current Year	(6,378,667)	(5,269,947)	(5,668,849)	(-709,818)	(+398,902)	37800	
37850 FY 2009	(5,424,200)	(6,215,200)	(6,641,982)	(+1,217,782)	(+426,782)	37850	
37900 Subtotal, Forward funded	(6,175,912)	(5,080,559)	(5,467,594)	(-708,318)	(+387,035)	37900	
37950 REHABILITATION SERVICES AND DISABILITY RESEARCH						37950	
38000 Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants	2,837,160	2,874,043	2,874,043	+36,883	---	38000	M
38100 Client Assistance State grants	11,782	11,782	11,782	---	---	38100	
38150 Training	38,438	38,438	38,438	---	---	38150	
38200 Demonstration and training programs	6,511	6,840	7,061	+550	+221	38200	
38250 Migrant and seasonal farmworkers	2,279	---	2,279	---	+2,279	38250	
38300 Recreational programs	2,518	---	2,518	---	+2,518	38300	
38350 Protection and advocacy of individual rights (PAIR)	16,489	16,489	16,489	---	---	38350	
38400 Projects with industry	19,538	---	19,538	---	+19,538	38400	
38450 Supported employment State grants	29,700	---	29,700	---	+29,700	38450	
38500 Independent living:						38500	
38550 State grants	22,588	22,588	22,588	---	---	38550	
38600 Centers	74,638	74,638	74,638	---	---	38600	
38650 Services for older blind individuals	32,895	32,895	32,895	---	---	38650	
38700 Subtotal, Independent living	130,121	130,121	130,121	---	---	38700	
38750 Program Improvement	835	633	633	-202	---	38750	
38800 Evaluation	1,473	1,973	1,473	---	-500	38800	
38849 Helen Keller National Center for Deaf/Blind Youth and						38849	
38850 Adults	8,511	8,011	8,511	---	+500	38850	
38900 National Inst. Disability and Rehab. Research (NIDRR)	106,705	106,705	106,705	---	---	38900	
38950 Assistive Technology	30,452	26,111	30,452	---	+4,341	38950	
39050 Subtotal, Discretionary programs	405,352	347,103	405,700	+348	+58,597	39050	
39100 Total, Rehabilitation services	3,242,512	3,221,146	3,279,743	+37,231	+58,597	39100	UA
39150 SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES						39150	
39200 AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND	17,573	17,573	17,573	---	---	39200	
39250 NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF (NTID):						39250	
39300 Operations	56,141	55,349	59,052	+2,911	+3,703	39300	
39400 Construction	---	913	1,705	+1,705	+792	39400	
39450 Total, NTID	56,141	56,262	60,757	+4,616	+4,495	39450	UA
39550 GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY:						39550	

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

		FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
39555	Operations	106,998	106,398	109,952	+2,954	+3,554	39555	UA
39560	Evaluation	---	600	---	---	-600	39560	
39570	Total, Gallaudet	106,998	106,998	109,952	+2,954	+2,954	39570	
39699	Total, Special Institutions for Persons with						39699	
39700	Disabilities	180,712	180,833	188,282	+7,570	+7,449	39700	
39750	CAREER AND ADULT EDUCATION						39750	
39800	Career Education:						39800	
39850	Basic State Grants/Secondary & Technical Education						39850	
39875	State Grants, current funded	390,553	600,000	415,553	+25,000	-184,447	39875	FF
39900	Advance from prior year	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)	---	---	39900	
39950	FY 2009	791,000	---	791,000	---	+791,000	39950	
40000	Subtotal, Basic State Grants, program level	1,181,553	600,000	1,206,553	+25,000	+606,553	40000	
40050	Tech-Prep Education State Grants	104,753	---	104,753	---	+104,753	40050	FF
40150	National Programs	10,000	10,000	8,000	-2,000	-2,000	40150	FF
40299	Tribally Controlled Postsec Voc/Tech Institutions	7,366	7,366	8,000	+634	+634	40299	UA
40300	Subtotal, Vocational Education	1,303,672	617,366	1,327,306	+23,634	+709,940	40300	
40350	Adult Education:						40350	
40375	State Grants/Adult basic and literacy education:						40375	
40400	State Grants, current funded	563,975	564,074	588,975	+25,000	+24,901	40400	FF
40450	National Programs:						40450	
40500	National Leadership Activities	9,005	9,096	7,000	-2,005	-2,096	40500	FF
40550	National Institute for Literacy	6,583	6,638	6,638	+55	---	40550	FF
40600	Subtotal, National programs	15,588	15,734	13,638	-1,950	-2,096	40600	
40650	Subtotal, Adult education	579,563	579,808	602,613	+23,050	+22,805	40650	
40710	Smaller Learning Communities, current funded	4,677	---	---	-4,677	---	40710	
40720	Smaller Learning Communities, forward funded	88,854	---	93,531	+4,677	+93,531	40720	FF
40725	State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders 2/	22,770	---	22,770	---	+22,770	40725	UA FF
40750	Total, Career and adult education	1,999,536	1,197,174	2,046,220	+46,684	+849,046	40750	UA
40800	Current Year	(1,208,536)	(1,197,174)	(1,255,220)	(+46,684)	(+58,046)	40800	
40850	FY 2009	(791,000)	---	(791,000)	---	(+791,000)	40850	
40900	Subtotal, forward funded	(1,196,493)	(1,189,808)	(1,247,220)	(+50,727)	(+57,412)	40900	
40950	STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE						40950	
41000	Pell Grants -- maximum grant (NA)	(4,310)	(4,050)	(4,700)	(+390)	(+650)	41000	
41050	Pell Grants	13,660,711	13,414,000	15,583,000	+1,922,289	+2,169,000	41050	
41100	Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants	770,933	---	770,933	---	+770,933	41100	
41150	Federal Work Study	980,354	980,492	980,492	+138	---	41150	
41200	Federal Perkins loan cancellations	65,471	---	65,471	---	+65,471	41200	
41400	LEAP program	64,987	---	64,987	---	+64,987	41400	
41490	Subtotal, discretionary programs	15,542,456	14,394,492	17,464,883	+1,922,427	+3,070,391	41490	
41500	Total, Student Financial Assistance	15,542,456	14,394,492	17,464,883	+1,922,427	+3,070,391	41500	UA
41610	STUDENT AID ADMINISTRATION 3/	718,450	708,216	708,216	-10,234	---	41610	UA
41612	Rescission (P.L. 110-28)	-500	---	---	+500	---	41612	
41615	Total, Student aid administration	717,950	708,216	708,216	-9,734	---	41615	UA
41650	HIGHER EDUCATION						41650	
41700	Aid for Institutional Development:						41700	
41750	Strengthening Institutions	79,535	79,535	79,535	---	---	41750	
41800	Hispanic Serving Institutions	94,914	94,911	99,500	+4,586	+4,589	41800	
41850	Strengthening Historically Black Colleges (HBCUs)	238,095	238,095	249,500	+11,405	+11,405	41850	
41898	Strengthening Historically Black Graduate						41898	
41900	Institutions	57,915	57,915	57,915	---	---	41900	
41949	Strengthening Alaska Native and						41949	
41950	Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions	11,785	---	11,785	---	+11,785	41950	
42000	Strengthening Tribal Colleges	23,570	18,570	24,475	+905	+5,905	42000	
42050	Subtotal, Aid for Institutional development	505,814	489,026	522,710	+16,896	+33,684	42050	UA

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

		FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
42100	International Education and Foreign Language:						42100	
42150	Domestic Programs	91,541	91,541	100,341	+8,800	+8,800	42150	UA
42200	Overseas Programs	12,610	12,610	13,610	+1,000	+1,000	42200	
42250	Institute for International Public Policy	1,600	1,600	1,700	+100	+100	42250	UA
42300	Subtotal, International Education & Foreign Lang	105,751	105,751	115,651	+9,900	+9,900	42300	
42375	Fund for the Improvement of Postsec. Ed. (FIPSE)	21,989	21,988	63,264	+41,275	+41,276	42375	UA
42400	Minority Science and Engineering Improvement	8,730	8,730	8,730	---	---	42400	UA
42500	Federal TRIO Programs	828,178	828,178	868,178	+40,000	+40,000	42500	UA
42550	GEAR UP	303,423	303,423	323,423	+20,000	+20,000	42550	UA
42600	Byrd Honors Scholarships	40,590	---	40,590	---	+40,590	42600	UA
42650	Javits Fellowships	9,699	9,797	9,699	---	-98	42650	UA
42700	Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need	30,067	30,064	30,067	---	+3	42700	UA
42750	Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants	59,895	---	40,000	-19,895	+40,000	42750	UA
42800	Child Care Access Means Parents in School	15,810	15,810	17,810	+2,000	+2,000	42800	UA
42825	Advancing America thru foreign language partnerships	---	24,000	---	---	-24,000	42825	
42850	Demonstration in Disabilities / Higher Education	6,875	---	6,875	---	+6,875	42850	UA
42900	Underground Railroad Program	1,980	---	---	-1,980	---	42900	UA
42950	GPRA data/HEA program evaluation	970	970	620	-350	-350	42950	UA
43050	B.J. Stupak Olympic Scholarships	970	---	970	---	+970	43050	UA
43075	Thurgood Marshall Legal education opportunities	2,946	---	2,946	---	+2,946	43075	
43100	Total, Higher education	1,943,687	1,837,737	2,051,533	+107,846	+213,796	43100	
43150	HOWARD UNIVERSITY						43150	
43200	Academic Program	204,405	204,405	204,405	---	---	43200	
43250	Endowment Program	3,526	---	3,526	---	+3,526	43250	UA
43300	Howard University Hospital	29,461	29,461	29,461	---	---	43300	
43350	Total, Howard University	237,392	233,866	237,392	---	+3,526	43350	
43400	COLLEGE HOUSING AND ACADEMIC FACILITIES LOANS(CHAFL)	571	481	481	-90	---	43400	
43450	HBCU CAPITAL FINANCING PROGRAM -- Federal Admin	209	188	188	-21	---	43450	
43500	INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SCIENCES						43500	
43600	Research, development and dissemination	162,552	162,535	157,552	-5,000	-4,983	43600	
43620	Statistics	90,022	119,022	96,022	+6,000	-23,000	43620	
43650	Regional Educational Laboratories	65,470	65,464	65,470	---	+6	43650	
43720	Research in special education	71,840	71,829	71,840	---	+11	43720	
43725	Special education studies and evaluations	9,900	9,628	9,900	---	+272	43725	
43730	Statewide data systems	24,552	49,152	37,508	+12,956	-11,644	43730	
43750	Assessment:						43750	
43800	National Assessment	88,095	110,595	91,095	+3,000	-19,500	43800	
43850	National Assessment Governing Board	5,054	6,037	5,716	+662	-321	43850	
43900	Subtotal, Assessment	93,149	116,632	96,811	+3,662	-19,821	43900	
44050	Total, IES	517,485	594,262	535,103	+17,618	-59,159	44050	
44100	DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT						44100	
44150	PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION						44150	
44160	Salaries and Expenses	416,487	429,631	391,487	-25,000	-38,144	44160	
44170	Building Modernization	2,100	17,303	3,000	+900	-14,303	44170	
44181	Total, Program administration	418,587	446,934	394,487	-24,100	-52,447	44181	
44200	OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS	91,205	93,771	93,771	+2,566	---	44200	
44250	OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	50,266	53,239	53,239	+2,973	---	44250	
44300	Total, Departmental management	560,058	593,944	541,497	-18,561	-52,447	44300	
44303	HURRICANE EDUCATION RECOVERY						44303	
44304	Aid for Elementary and Secondary Education,						44304	
44305	Supplemental (P.L. 110-28) (emergency):						44305	
44307	Recruitment, retention, and compensation						44307	
44308	of personnel	30,000	---	---	-30,000	---	44308	

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request	
44316 Aid for Institutions of Higher Education, Supplemental						44316
44317 (P.L. 110-28) (emergency)	30,000	---	---	-30,000	---	44317
44319						44319
44321 Total, Hurricane Education Recovery	60,000	---	---	-60,000	---	44321
44500 Total, Title III, Department of Education	60,378,454	59,098,720	64,942,185	+4,563,731	+5,843,465	44500
44550 Current Year	(45,344,953)	(44,065,219)	(47,937,985)	(+2,593,032)	(+3,872,766)	44550
44555 Emergency appropriations	(68,594)	---	---	(-68,594)	---	44555
44560 FY 2009	(15,033,501)	(15,033,501)	(17,004,200)	(+1,970,699)	(+1,970,699)	44560
44599 Title III Footnotes:						44599
44600 1/ Funding for Striving readers was first forward						44600
44601 funded in the FY 2006 conference agreement.						44601
44602 2/ Previously funded under Office of Safe and						44602
44603 Drug Free Schools.						44603
44604 3/ In prior years, $600M was included as mandatory.						44604
44650 TITLE IV - RELATED AGENCIES						44650
44885 COMMITTEE FOR PURCHASE FROM PEOPLE WHO ARE BLIND OR						44885
44890 SEVERELY DISABLED	4,652	4,994	4,994	+342	---	44890
44900 CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE						44900
44905 OPERATING EXPENSES						44905
44910 Domestic Volunteer Service Programs:						44910
44950 Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA)	95,468	89,734	95,468	---	+5,734	44950
44955 VISTA cost-share revolving fund	3,500	---	---	-3,500	---	44955
45050 National Senior Volunteer Corps:						45050
45100 Foster Grandparents Program	110,937	97,550	110,937	---	+13,387	45100
45150 Senior Companion Program	46,964	41,299	46,964	---	+5,665	45150
45200 Retired Senior Volunteer Program	59,685	65,643	59,685	---	-5,958	45200
45300 Subtotal, Senior Volunteers	217,586	204,492	217,586	---	+13,094	45300
45400 Subtotal, Domestic Volunteer Service Programs	316,554	294,226	313,054	-3,500	+18,828	45400
45415 National and Community Service Programs:						45415
45425 National service trust	117,720	122,521	122,521	+4,801	---	45425
45430 AmeriCorps grants	264,825	255,625	255,625	-9,200	---	45430
45435 Innovation, assistance, and other activities	29,771	12,697	13,000	-16,771	+303	45435
45440 Evaluation	3,960	3,960	3,960	---	---	45440
45445 National Civilian Community Corps	26,789	11,620	11,620	-15,169	---	45445
45450 Learn and Serve America: K-12 and Higher Ed	37,125	32,099	37,125	---	+5,026	45450
45455 State Commission Administrative Grants	12,516	12,000	12,000	-516	---	45455
45460 Points of Light Foundation	---	8,900	---	---	-8,900	45460
45470 Subtotal, National & Community Service Programs	492,706	459,422	455,851	-36,855	-3,571	45470
45474 Total, Operating expenses	809,260	753,648	768,905	-40,355	+15,257	45474
45475 National and Community Service, Salaries & expenses	70,324	69,520	68,964	-1,360	-556	45475
45480 Office of the Inspector General	4,963	5,512	5,512	+549	---	45480
45490 Total, Corp. for National and Community Service	884,547	828,680	843,381	-41,166	+14,701	45490 UA
45500 CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING:						45500
45550 FY 2010 (current) with FY 2009 comparable	400,000	---	420,000	+20,000	+420,000	45550
45600 FY 2009 advance with FY 2008 comparable (NA)	(400,000)	(400,000)	(400,000)	---	---	45600
45620 Subtotal, FY 2009 program level	400,000	400,000	400,000	---	---	45620
45650 FY 2008 advance with FY 2007 comparable (NA)	(400,000)	(400,000)	(400,000)	---	---	45650
45675 Rescission of FY 2008 funds (NA)	---	(-50,000)	---	---	(+50,000)	45675
45680 Subtotal, FY 2008 program level	400,000	350,000	400,000	---	+50,000	45680
45700 Digitalization program, current funded	29,700	---	29,700	---	+29,700	45700
45710 Previous appropriated funds (NA)	---	(30,600)	---	---	(-30,600)	45710
45725 Interconnection, current funded	34,650	---	26,750	-7,900	+26,750	45725
45730 Previous appropriated funds (NA)	---	(26,750)	---	---	(-26,750)	45730
45750 Subtotal, FY 2008 appropriation	64,350	---	56,450	-7,900	+56,450	45750 UA
45850 FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE	42,849	43,800	44,450	+1,601	+650	45850
45900 FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION	7,778	8,096	8,096	+318	---	45900
45950 INSTITUTE OF MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES	247,205	271,246	264,812	+17,607	-6,434	45950
46000 MEDICARE PAYMENT ADVISORY COMMISSION	12,066	10,748	10,748	-1,318	---	46000
46050 NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFO SCIENCE	989	---	---	-989	---	46050

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	Recommended vs. Comparable	Recommended vs. Request		
46100 NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY	3,426	3,113	3,113	-313	---	46100	UA
46200 NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD	251,507	256,238	256,988	+5,481	+750	46200	
46250 NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD	11,596	12,242	12,992	+1,396	+750	46250	
46300 OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION	10,471	10,696	10,696	+225	---	46300	
46350 RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD						46350	
46400 Dual Benefits Payments Account	88,000	79,000	79,000	-9,000	---	46400	
46450 Less Income Tax Receipts on Dual Benefits	-6,000	-6,000	-6,000	---	---	46450	
46500 Subtotal, Dual Benefits	82,000	73,000	73,000	-9,000	---	46500	
46550 Federal Payment to the RR Retirement Account	150	150	150	---	---	46550	M
46600 Limitation on Administration	103,694	103,518	103,694	---	+176	46600	
46650 Inspector General	7,173	7,606	7,606	+433	---	46650	
46700 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION						46700	
46750 Payments to Social Security Trust Funds	20,470	28,140	28,140	+7,670	---	46750	M
47150 SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME						47150	
47200 Federal benefit payments	37,204,000	40,675,000	40,675,000	+3,471,000	---	47200	M
47250 Beneficiary services	---	36,000	36,000	+36,000	---	47250	M
47300 Research and demonstration	27,000	27,000	27,000	---	---	47300	M
47350 Administration	2,950,169	2,983,000	3,020,525	+70,356	+37,525	47350	
47400 Subtotal, SSI program level	40,181,169	43,721,000	43,758,525	+3,577,356	+37,525	47400	
47450 Less funds advanced in prior year	-11,110,000	-16,810,000	-16,810,000	-5,700,000	---	47450	M
47500 Subtotal, regular SSI current year	29,071,169	26,911,000	26,948,525	-2,122,644	+37,525	47500	
47650 Total, SSI, current request	29,071,169	26,911,000	26,948,525	-2,122,644	+37,525	47650	
47700 New advance, 1st quarter, FY 2008	16,810,000	14,800,000	14,800,000	-2,010,000	---	47700	M
47710 Total, SSI program	45,881,169	41,711,000	41,748,525	-4,132,644	+37,525	47710	
47750 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES						47750	
47800 OASDI Trust Funds	4,598,834	4,698,292	4,760,767	+161,933	+62,475	47800	
47850 HI/SMI Trust Funds	1,626,570	1,679,661	1,679,661	+53,091	---	47850	
47900 Social Security Advisory Board	2,000	2,000	2,000	---	---	47900	
47950 SSI	2,950,169	2,868,000	2,905,525	-44,644	+37,525	47950	
48000 Subtotal, regular LAE	9,177,573	9,247,953	9,347,953	+170,380	+100,000	48000	
48002 Additional CDR Funding:						48002	
48003 OASDI Trust Funds	---	98,000	98,000	+98,000	---	48003	
48004 SSI	---	115,000	115,000	+115,000	---	48004	
48005 Subtotal, additional CDR funding	---	213,000	213,000	+213,000	---	48005	
48020 User Fees:						48020	
48040 SSI User Fee activities	117,000	135,000	135,000	+18,000	---	48040	
48050 SSPA User Fee Activities	1,000	1,000	1,000	---	---	48050	
48060 Subtotal, User fees	118,000	136,000	136,000	+18,000	---	48060	
48100 Total, Limitation on Administrative Expenses	9,295,573	9,596,953	9,696,953	+401,380	+100,000	48100	
48450 OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL						48450	
48500 Federal Funds	25,902	27,000	27,000	+1,098	---	48500	
48550 Trust Funds	66,149	68,047	68,047	+1,898	---	48550	
48600 Total, Office of the Inspector General	92,051	95,047	95,047	+2,996	---	48600	
48750 Adjustment: Trust fund transfers from general revenues	-2,950,169	-2,983,000	-3,020,525	-70,356	-37,525	48750	
48800 Total, Social Security Administration	52,339,094	48,448,140	48,548,140	-3,790,954	+100,000	48800	
48850 Federal funds	46,045,541	41,902,140	41,939,665	-4,105,876	+37,525	48850	
48900 Current year	(29,235,541)	(27,102,140)	(27,139,665)	(-2,095,876)	(+37,525)	48900	
48950 New advances, 1st quarter	(16,810,000)	(14,800,000)	(14,800,000)	(-2,010,000)	---	48950	
49000 Trust funds	6,293,553	6,546,000	6,608,475	+314,922	+62,475	49000	

LABOR-HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2008
(Amounts in thousands)

		FY 2007 Comparable	FY 2008 Request	Recommended	----- Recommended vs. ----- Comparable	Request	
49100	Total, Title IV, Related Agencies	54,473,547	50,082,267	50,669,310	-3,804,237	+587,043	49100
49150	Federal Funds	48,057,061	43,414,395	43,938,787	-4,118,274	+524,392	49150
49200	Current Year	(30,847,061)	(28,614,395)	(28,718,787)	(-2,128,274)	(+104,392)	49200
49250	FY 2009 Advance	(16,810,000)	(14,800,000)	(14,800,000)	(-2,010,000)	---	49250
49300	FY 2010 Advance	(400,000)	---	(420,000)	(+20,000)	(+420,000)	49300
49350	Trust Funds	6,416,486	6,667,872	6,730,523	+314,037	+62,651	49350
49355	Title IV Footnotes:						49355
49371	1/ Carryover funding available from PL 108-173						49371
49640	RECAP						49640
49760	Mandatory, total in bill	409,271,907	455,463,526	455,665,526	+46,393,619	+202,000	49760
49780	Less advances for subsequent years	-84,945,617	-84,930,669	-84,930,669	+14,948	---	49780
49800	Plus advances provided in prior years	76,897,825	84,945,617	84,945,617	+8,047,792	---	49800
49820	Total, mandatory, current year	401,224,115	455,478,474	455,680,474	+54,456,359	+202,000	49820
49860	Discretionary, total in bill	145,262,591	141,710,017	154,238,378	+8,975,787	+12,528,361	49860
49880	Less advances for subsequent years	-19,285,301	-18,885,301	-21,276,000	-1,990,699	-2,390,699	49880
49900	Plus advances provided in prior years	19,285,301	19,285,301	19,285,301	---	---	49900
49920	Subtotal, Discretionary, current year	145,262,591	142,110,017	152,247,679	+6,985,088	+10,137,662	49920
49960	Scorekeeping adjustments:						49960
50100	SSI User Fee Collection	-117,000	-135,000	-135,000	-18,000	---	50100
50125	Adjustment to balance to CBO (technical)	2,000	---	---	-2,000	---	50125
50126	Adjustment to balance to CBO's ATB pay (technical)	6,401	---	---	-6,401	---	50126
50135	Vaccines for children amendment	---	---	2,000	+2,000	+2,000	50135
50136	Average Weekly Insured Unemployment (AWIU) Conting	---	45,000	---	---	-45,000	50136
50194	Health professions student loan (rescission)	---	-100,000	---	---	+100,000	50194
50198	Health Center Loan Guarantee Program (rescission)	---	-5,000	---	---	+5,000	50198
50200	Social services block grant reduction (rescission)	---	-500,000	---	---	+500,000	50200
50205	Voc rehabilitation reduction (rescission)	---	-36,883	---	---	+36,883	50205
50210	Excess H-1B Fee Revenue (rescission)	---	-50,000	-70,000	-70,000	-20,000	50210
50215	National skills standards board (rescission)	---	-44	-44	-44	---	50215
50220	TES prior year balances (rescission)	---	-335,000	-335,000	-335,000	---	50220
50237	Department of Labor (P.L. 110-28)						50237
50238	(Rescission of emergency funds)	-8,594	---	---	+8,594	---	50238
50239	EFAST2 filing system (DOL) (P.L. 110-28)	---	1,000	1,000	+1,000	---	50239
50241	2006 Bulk monovalent annual flu vaccine purchase						50241
50242	(rescission)	-29,680	-29,680	---	+29,680	+29,680	50242
50243	Medicare eligible accruals (permanent,indefinite)	36,288	37,365	37,365	+1,077	---	50243
50244	CMS Survey and Certification User Fee	---	-35,000	---	---	+35,000	50244
50245	CPB (FY 2008 Rescission)	---	-50,000	---	---	+50,000	50245
50249	Reallocation of FY02 carryover from PL107-117(HHS)	-16,120	---	---	+16,120	---	50249
50252	Training and employment services (leg. proposal)	---	745,000	---	---	-745,000	50252
50253	State unemployment insurance and employment						50253
50254	service operations (leg. proposal)	---	-61,000	---	---	+61,000	50254
50255	Unemployment trust fund (leg. proposal)	---	-685,000	---	---	+685,000	50255
50260	Less emergency appropriations	-519,000	---	---	+519,000	---	50260
50280	Total, discretionary	144,616,886	140,915,775	151,748,000	+7,131,114	+10,832,225	50280
50285	Adjustment to balance with 2007 enacted	-92,138	---	---	+92,138	---	50285
50291	Total, discretionary (FY 2007 enacted)	144,524,748	140,915,775	151,748,000	+7,223,252	+10,832,225	50291
50320	Grand total, current year (incl FY 2007 comparable)	545,841,001	596,394,249	607,428,474	+61,587,473	+11,034,225	50320
50325	Grand total, current year (incl FY 2007 enacted)	545,748,863	596,394,249	607,428,474	+61,679,611	+11,034,225	50325

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I'd like to begin my remarks by thanking Chairman OBEY for his willingness to accommodate many of the programmatic requests that we made. I appreciate his attention to the concerns important to my constituents and to my State.

As you know, this is a very complex and demanding bill, and Chairman OBEY's staff has done a fine job supporting him in this task. I also would like to recognize Steve Crane and Anne Marie Goldsmith from the minority office for their attention to detail in this legislation.

Let's make no mistake. This bill spends a great deal of money, approximately $6.5 billion more than last year in discretionary funding. But this bill addresses many of the most critical issues confronting our Nation—our families' health care, our children's education, our retirement security and our own workplace protection and job training needs.

If I were chairman, and I had this allocation, I'm not sure I would have written the bill a whole lot differently.

Specifically, this bill provides needed increases for community health centers. It advances my long-time efforts to advance funding for graduate medical education, of which my State, New York, trains 20 percent of the doctors in the Nation. So it is of critical importance to our teaching hospitals. And also the need for our Nation's poison control centers.

It funds important biomedical research, telemedicine and electronic medical records, which in the long run will dramatically reduce the cost of medical expenses.

□ 1615

It recognizes the need to provide seniors and those on fixed incomes with assistance paying high utility bills through the LIHEAP program. It continues Republican-led efforts to boost Federal funding for elementary and secondary education in support of the No Child Left Behind bill and also supporting programs for youth at risk. And thanks to my committee colleagues' support, the bill includes my amendment to boost funding for special education.

As most of you know, when the Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act passed in 1977, Congress authorized annual Federal expenditures of 40 percent to help cover the cost of education for children with special needs. But in 1995 the Federal Government paid only 7.8 percent of those costs for our children with disabilities. That puts an additional burden on our local school districts. If we are only paying about 8 percent of the cost, that means they are forced to cover the other 92 percent instead of the 60 percent that we had told them they would have to cover. With this increase, we will provide just under 18 percent of the cost in 2008, or about half of our commitment. At least it is progress in the right direction.

This increased Federal support is important. Back in my home State of New York, the instructional expense for regular education for a student in 2003 and 2004 was $8,177 per student. For a special education student that cost was about double, $17,600. This bill boosts the maximum Pell Grant award to make a college education more attainable for more Americans, and it supports initiatives for senior health and wellness.

I am grateful to Chairman OBEY for including funds to take care of the health needs of those who responded heroically, and in many cases putting their own health and lives at risk, to the September 11 terrorist attacks in New York City.

And I thank the chairman for responding to my request and attending to an issue of growing importance to more and more young American families: the emerging threat of food allergies. Food allergies more and more are affecting families across the country, and nobody really understands what is going on, why these allergies are occurring, but they do put these young people's lives at risk. This bill provides a new line of funding for research and outreach to parents of children with food allergies. While it is only a small amount of money that is necessary for the effort this year, the impact it will have is dramatic.

In addition, I have some concerns with the additional $2 billion in advance funding that was provided by the Budget Committee. My concern is that advance funding can cause serious problems if future allocations for this bill are not as robust.

With that said, again I would like to congratulate Chairman OBEY and his staff for what I think on the whole is a well-written bill. I want to reiterate my appreciation for his willingness to work with us.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I would also like to take this time to thank all of the staff people who worked on this bill, most especially Rob Nabors, Christina Hamilton, John Daniel, Lesley Turner, Kirstin Brost, Cheryl Smith, Sue Quantius, Nicole Kunko, Muftiah McCartin, Teri Bergman, Andria Oliver, Beth Chaney, Steve Crane, Anne Marie Goldsmith, Ron Anderson, and the associate staff as well. We certainly could not have put together the bill without them, and without them we would be making a whole lot more mistakes than we are likely to make today.

Madam Chairman, I reserve balance of my time.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, at this time I yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished leader on the committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to both Chairman OBEY and my ranking member, the gentleman from New York, for the cooperative spirit in which they worked to produce this bill, a very difficult bill in the final analysis. With that, I would like to say to Mr. OBEY I very much appreciate his ongoing cooperation as we try to work on all the bills in the appropriations process this year to make some sense out of a very difficult year. I would also like to express my deep appreciation for the fabulous work done by the staff of this committee.

And having gone that far, Madam Chairman, let me say that the fiscal year 2008 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and Related Agencies bill, Labor-HHS, reflects a fundamental difference in opinion on the level of funding necessary to support the Federal Government's role in education, health and workforce programs. Regardless of that disagreement, House Republicans agree that many of the programs funded in this bill are vitally important. The majority party would have the public believe otherwise.

In fact, House Republicans have shown the American people over the past 12 years that we recognize the importance of these programs. With history as our witness, we have demonstrated our commitment not in words but in action.

It should not be forgotten that it was House Republicans who demonstrated a commitment to fundamental research by doubling the budget of National Institutes for Health. It was House Republicans who bolstered the discretionary budget for the Department of Education by 72 percent in inflation-adjusted dollars.

Even with our unquestionable dedication to the programs in this bill over the last 12 years, Republicans stand accused by the Democratic majority of shortchanging fundamental research, shortchanging education, and according to the rhetoric of the day, shortchanging our very future. This rhetoric diminishes all that we do as elected officials, and it does not serve the Congress or our country well.

The primary difference is that Republicans believe that we must balance the benefits of these worthwhile programs with the fact that the American taxpayer must pay for them.

I know that Chairman OBEY feels very strongly about the Labor-H bill. He is now working two full-time jobs as chairman of the full committee and chairman of this subcommittee. He has also devoted one-half of the $20 billion or so increase over the President's budget request in the fiscal year 2008 302(b) allocation to the priorities contained in this bill.

The fiscal year 2008 Labor-H bill is $10.2 billion over the President's budget request and $6.6 billion over the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. Chairman OBEY has said repeatedly that it is necessary

to increase the subcommittee allocation dramatically to make up for the past funding shortfalls. But I remind the chairman that these programs have grown by $85 billion over the last 13 years.

When Labor-HHS Chairman Neil Smith, a Democrat, presented his bill in 1994, total discretionary budget authority totaled $65 billion. If he had predicted in 1994 that this very same bill, which largely covers the same agencies today as it did then, would increase by $85 billion over the next 13 years, the chairman of the full committee, who happened to be DAVID OBEY, probably would not have believed it.

By any objective standard, whether you are JERRY LEWIS or DAVID OBEY, $85 billion is a healthy increase, and today the committee is poised to spend an additional $10.2 billion under the mistaken notion that throwing money at our Nation's problems will cause them to fade away.

While many of these programs are popular on both sides of the aisle, a $10.2 billion increase is not without consequence, particularly when this bill contains what can rightly be considered lower priority and duplicative programs. For example, the committee-reported bill provides $420 million in 2-year advance appropriations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Most objective observers will agree that providing these resources may be nice to do, but it hardly measures up to providing health care services to the poorest of Americans in terms of its priority.

Furthermore, there are a host of programs in the bill that duplicate activities that are funded elsewhere, not just in this bill but in other appropriations bills as well. For example, this legislation continues three programs that deal with violence prevention; one in the Labor Department, another in the Department of Health and Human Services, the third in the Department of Education. There are additional programs within the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice that serve exactly the same purpose. Little real oversight was conducted to ferret out unnecessary and wasteful spending on these duplicative programs.

Yet another example is the funding the bill provides within the Administration for Children and Families for community economic development. According to this very committee report, these funds are intended to support employment, training, and business development opportunities for low-income residents in poor communities. Services that are already provided by the Department of Labor, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Economic Development Administration.

Surely the majority party could have met the very highest priority needs in this bill such as community health care centers or programs providing funding to educate youngsters living in poverty by eliminating duplicative programs or curtailing spending on lower priorities. Instead of making the tough choices between high- and low-priority programs or eliminating the duplication, this bill takes the easy way out: just spend more money.

The budget resolution adopted by the Democrat majority earlier this year and the appropriations bills that we are now considering spend some $23 billion more than the President requested. As we move forward with consideration of the fiscal year 2008 appropriations bills, Members of Congress ought to be aware that the average additional burden on the individual taxpayer to finance the spending spree outlined in the majority's budget will amount to roughly $3,000 to the individual taxpayer, $3,000.

I know it is difficult for many Members to oppose substantial increases in these popular programs; however, I remind Chairman OBEY and our colleagues that these increases are not without consequence.

Make no mistake about it. Excessive spending will force the American taxpayer to shoulder the burden of this extra spending. And if past is prologue, we will continue to pass this debt along to future generations.

As we complete consideration of our work this week, the House will have approved an additional $20.4 billion in spending above the President's budget request for the next year. This level is $36.4 billion above the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

So where is the Appropriations Committee in terms of getting its work done this year? It is July 17 and the House has five bills left to complete. The Senate has yet to take any of its bills to the floor and likely will not this month. Based on the present pace in both bodies, I have grave concern about our ability to complete our work this year through the regular order process.

Chairman OBEY is fond of pointing out that the process in the House this year has been delayed by having to complete action on the fiscal year 2007 bills. It is no surprise that he often fails to mention the role that the Senate played in this equation. The Senate failed to complete its work last year, and today history is repeating itself.

It is ironically unfortunate that the same type of legislative train wreck is likely to occur again this year. The scenario is becoming more and more apparent with each passing day. While it is only July, if past experience is any guide, a warning is in order. Once again the Senate is showing absolutely no inclination or ability towards moving appropriations bills, setting up the inevitable end-of-the-year omnibus strategy.

My colleagues, it has not yet been stated in so many words, but this is, or soon will become, the strategy to complete our work this year. And mark my words, not only will most of our appropriations bills end up in an omnibus, it will be a well-adorned Christmas tree filled with plenty of legislative goodies, perfectly timed to coincide with the holidays.

□ 1630

I want to be very clear about this, an omnibus is absolutely the wrong and fiscally reckless approach to completing this year's work. It would inflate the budget deficit, reward bad behavior, and negate any semblance of fiscal discipline demonstrated by this body in recent years.

Short of passing our conference reports individually, the best alternative would be to once again pass a clean year-long continuing resolution at the current rate of fiscal year 2007 levels, and without Member projects. That is, of course, an undesirable option. But if at the end of the process the House and the Senate cannot complete their work in a responsible fashion, passing a clean CR will be the best option remaining to complete this year's work.

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Thank you to Chairman OBEY, Ranking Member WALSH, and their staff for their hard work in crafting this bill.

At the start of the year, Chairman OBEY asked us to consider not only the challenges of today, but those of the year ahead, and I believe the bill does just that. The bill addresses the appalling reality that 46 million people in this country lack health insurance by providing a $200 million increase for community health centers, $75 million for grants for States to develop plans to cover their uninsured, $75 million for States to create insurance pools for high-risk individuals. Furthermore, recognizing that one of the best ways to keep women healthy is to provide them with access to high-quality family planning services and other preventative health care, the bill provides a $27 million increase to the Title X family program for low-income women.

The bill acknowledges that millions of students are shut out of college for financial reasons or lack of preparation in the early years and increases the maximum Pell Grant award by $200, restores proposed cuts to supplemental education grants, and increases both GEAR UP and TRIO.

The bill provides desperately needed relief to after-school programs by increasing 21st Century Community Learning Centers by $125 million. As a result of the Republican-controlled Congress level funding this program for more than 5 years in a row, thousands of children, including more than 34,000 in New York could lose these programs if this increase isn't approved quickly.

At a time when we're on the cusp of finding cures for some of the world's most devastating diseases, this bill increases our investment in biomedical research, and the bill provides a $700

million increase for NIH which would allow for hundreds of new research grants.

However, I would be remiss if I didn't express my disappointment that the mark also includes an increase by the same amount for abstinence-only programs when there is mounting evidence questioning the accuracy of some of the curriculum taught in those programs.

We all agree that we must teach our children that abstinence is the best way to prevent pregnancy and STDs. We should all also agree that abstinence-until-marriage programs must provide children with the most medically accurate information available. Unfortunately, study after study has found that many of these programs teach inaccurate and even harmful information to our young people.

I also hope to work with Chairman OBEY as the bill moves through the legislative process to reverse the potential damage of the large Workforce Investment Act reduction that was passed during Committee markup. If these cuts are enacted, New York could lose approximately $28 million in worker training funds.

Despite these two concerns, this bill—for the first time in a number of years—takes big steps towards addressing some of our nation's most pressing challenges. I am proud to support it, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I now yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), former chairman of the committee.

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

Mr. REGULA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal year 2008 appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.

As you know, I chaired the subcommittee responsible for providing the funding in this bill for the previous 6 years, and I am pleased to provide my support today. The bill provides Federal funds that touch every American. And it's important in serving as the backbone for our medical research, job training, and key education programs at all levels of learning.

I do want to compliment Chairman OBEY and Ranking Member WALSH on the excellent job they did in crafting this legislation. Within the bill's allocation, they have targeted increased dollars in key areas that I strongly support.

First, as we continue to ask for more in the performance of our teachers and students under the No Child Left Behind Act, we continue to maintain the vital role the classroom teacher plays in student achievement. I am extremely pleased that the bill funds the Teacher Incentive Fund, a program that awards teachers for student achievement at $99 million.

Next, our Nation's future economic success depends on an educated population. An education that ends at high school no longer suffices in our globally competitive world. Therefore, I strongly support the increase in the Pell Grant for students, which reaches a new high of $4,700 in this bill.

Our Nation's biomedical research effort has made great strides since we doubled the funding for the National Institutes of Health during my tenure and led by our previous speaker in years past.

I am pleased that the bill will build on NIH funding in our continued attempts as a Nation to seek treatments and cures for the debilitating diseases that strike us, our family and friends.

Next, I talked about our competitive global economy, and I support funding to assist our current workers in improving their skills through the Department of Labor's employment and job training programs that are passed through to our local communities for use directly in these communities and for Jobs Corps, which gives our young people a second chance to participate in the workforce in society.

I could go on highlighting the numerous programs in the bill that impact Americans. But let me close by expressing my support for the increase in funding for the administrative costs for the Social Security Administration.

While the benefits Americans receive for Social Security or disability support are provided through mandatory spending, without good people and a sufficient staff to process these claims, the program would not run. Therefore, I support the $400 million increase in funding for the SSA administrative cost. Americans deserve effective and efficient responses to their claim requests. And with that funding, I'm hopeful the SSA will continue to improve and shorten its response times.

Again, this is a very good bill. I congratulate my colleagues on the subcommittee for their work in bringing it before us today. I urge my colleagues in the House to support this bill.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has 10 minutes; the gentleman from Wisconsin has 17 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I want to thank the Chair for the time.

Madam Chairman, I rise to voice my strong support for H.R. 4033, the Labor-HHS bill. There is no bill that Congress produces on an annual basis that has such a profound impact on everyday people's lives like this bill.

I want to congratulate Chairman OBEY and the subcommittee staff on the product that is before us today. I also want to thank Ranking Member WALSH and the minority subcommittee staff working with us to produce this bill.

I think former Labor-HHS Chairman RALPH REGULA said it best when he described this bill as the ''people's bill.'' And I want to commend the gentleman for his statement in support of this product.

This might seem obvious, but your view depends on where you stand. From where I stand, I see an America today where the overall unemployment rate is 4.5 percent. For African Americans it's 8.5 percent. The average life expectancy is 77.6 years. For African Americans it is 69.2. Sixty-three percent of white students graduate from college. For African Americans, it's 43 percent. These numbers represent real problems for real people that need real solutions, not tax cuts and amendments to cut 1 percent and .5 percent across the board. This bill is a solution that illustrates how Congress can solve real problems.

We've heard from the other side already language like ''wrong,'' ''fiscally and recklessly irresponsible.'' The entire debate about earmarks is to divert our attention away from these very real problems that this bill seeks to solve.

Specifically, this bill includes a $43 million nominal increase for Job Corps, projecting the administration's proposal to cut 4,310 student training slots. The administration's request for CDC would have reduced funding for our primary health activities by $159.4 million, cutting childhood immunizations, State and local public health emergency preparedness, and efforts to combat chronic diseases such as diabetes and heart disease and emerging infection.

Madam Chairman, I encourage Members to look at the facts around this bill and to be supportive.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, a member of the subcommittee, Dr. WELDON.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise to speak about an amendment that was introduced by me in the committee, and overwhelmingly adopted by the committee by voice vote. And I rise mainly to address the concerns being raised by members of the American Academy of Pediatrics and other members sending letters to the Congress from the public health community.

Let me state from the outset, as a physician, I strongly support vaccinating children and adults. Indeed, I gave a lot of vaccines. Immunizing kids against the flu is a particularly good idea. It prevents the kids from getting the flu, but it also, because children have bad personal hygiene and they tend to spread the flu around if they get it, by vaccinating kids and preventing them from getting the flu you actually prevent adults from getting the flu.

Certainly I believe the American Academy of Pediatrics is a great organization, as are the public health officials who do the work in administering these vaccines, even though they are complaining about my amendment.

Let me just state from the outset, my amendment simply implements the policy that the American Academy of Pediatrics established in 1999, when they stated, The Public Health Service, the American Academy of Pediatrics and vaccine manufacturers agree that thimerosal-containing vaccines should be removed as soon as possible. My amendment does nothing more than implement that policy.

Thimerosal is a mercury-containing preservative that is toxic. If I brought some thimerosal to this Chamber, spilled it on that table, we would have to evacuate the Chamber. That is how toxic it is.

Now, in 1999, the manufacturers, in coordination with the AAP, the CDC and the drug industry, removed all of the mercury from all of the childhood vaccines in 18 months. They removed it from the DPT and the hepatitis B. Eighteen months after adopting that policy in 1999, all of the pediatric vaccines had been produced and manufactured without any mercury in them. And then in 2004, a decision was made to add flu vaccine to the vaccine scheduled for children. And since that time it has been very difficult for me to get the American Academy of Pediatrics and the CDC and the manufacturers to take this issue seriously and get the mercury out of the childhood vaccines.

And let me just also add, this is a bipartisan issue. I have a bill that I've introduced with Representative CAROLYN MALONEY from New York to get all this mercury out. There are many Democrats and many Republicans on this bill.

Now, some of the people who are opposing my amendment are actually claiming that children who were not vaccinated last year who got the flu died, and if there's not enough flu vaccine available, that more children may not get vaccinated and there may be more deaths. I would like to just simply point out that one of the issues here is public confidence in the vaccine program, and that many of these parents who didn't get their kids vaccinated maybe didn't get their kids vaccinated because they were concerned about the mercury in the flu vaccine. And, indeed, you might ask the question of the deaths that occurred last year, might some of them not have occurred if we had a mercury-free vaccine on the market?

Now, I want to refer to this chart briefly because I think this basically says it all.

In 2004, we were producing a little bit over 80 million doses of flu vaccine, and today we're producing over 130 million doses. But yet, officials have made no attempt to increase the amount of mercury-free vaccine that is being produced in this country. Mind you, the Europeans are producing more than enough mercury-free to vaccinate their kids. They have figured out how to do it. Mind you, I said earlier 18 months was all it took to get the mercury out of all of the other childhood vaccines. And why, after all these years, year after year, they say they want to get the mercury out of the childhood vaccines and they're not doing it. They're got getting it out of the flu vaccine. And they can do it and they will do it.

What this really boils down to, my colleagues, is an issue of leadership. CDC, AAP, the public health community has not exercised proper leadership on this issue, and it falls to us to do the right thing.

The language that I put in this bill is not covering this flu season, it's covering next flu season. They have more than a year to address this issue. I think they can. And that's why I put that language in the bill.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

(Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, and I commend Chairman OBEY and Ranking Member WALSH for their strong leadership in crafting this bipartisan legislation.

Our commitment to expand access to health care and other essential human services is reaffirmed in this bill by restoring funding to programs that put health care within the reach of an additional 2 million Americans.

For example, under the provisions of this bill, community health centers can provide an additional one million medically underserved Americans with primary and preventive care.

□ 1645

Education funding levels in this bill also demonstrate our deep-seated commitment to investing in educational opportunity for all America's children. For example, this bill helps level the playing field for disadvantaged minority students by beginning, finally, to provide adequate resources for title I. The bill reinvests in the American workforce by restoring funding to critical education and job training programs that have been neglected in recent years. In particular, the bill provides a much needed increase to America's migrant and seasonal farmworkers who are the backbone of the agricultural industry.

Finally, on the issue I have worked on for many years, I am particularly gratified that the committee has provided funds for the STOP Underage Drinking programs. This recently enacted initiative will go a long way toward reducing the crises of underage drinking in our country and the tragic consequences it has on our youth and society as a whole.

I look forward to continuing to work with our Democratic leadership and my colleagues in the House to move our Nation closer to the goal of ensuring every American has access to quality health care, every student has a real chance to succeed, and every worker is given the tools to prosper.

Madam Chairman, in closing, I thank Chairman OBEY for his hard work and for his commitment to improving the lives of Americans. I extend my gratitude to Cheryl Smith and the rest of the subcommittee staff for their dedication and commitment as well.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the former Governor.

Mr. CASTLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I would just like to make two brief points, perhaps to Chairman OBEY, about this bill that concern me, although I think the bill is well done. I am basically supportive of it.

The first is something which the President has vetoed, the stem cell research legislation. Back in August of 2001, he signed an order which allowed 21 different stem cell lines to be developed. There was a lot of discussion that in this particular bill that we could have actually updated that date from 2001 until 2007.

There have been 400 private lines developed since that time; that is, without any Federal dollars whatsoever. They could have been used for research by anybody if indeed we could have had it approved in this legislation. As a result of that, I drafted an amendment to do just that. But I have been informed that it will not be in order if I were to present it, so I will not present it.

I think this is a missed opportunity. I say to the chairman, because he was supportive of the stem cell research, that my judgment is we should do everything in our power to be able to enhance and to further that research in America. This was an opportunity which is unfortunately lost.

The other point I would like to make also deals with health, which is a matter of great concern to all of us, obviously, and that is the increase in NIH research. Basically, when you boil it all down, the increase here is 1.9 percent. It has been widely discussed that it's 2.6 percent. But this includes $900 million to the global HIV/AIDS fund that will be transferred immediately to the Department of State. It will not go directly into research.

The amount which is left is 1.9 percent, which would be almost the smallest increase for NIH in 38 years. We will lose length and quality of life to disease and disability. New research opportunities will go unfunded. The number of new therapies will continue to decline. Flat funding may discourage, along with the embryonic stem cell research going by the boards, the best and brightest young scientists remaining in the United States. Another year of failure to provide sustained, strong growth and Federal support for medical research is a problem.

Madam Chairman, I would hope before it is all said and done that we can address these two issues.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Chairman, I want to rise and congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin, Chairman OBEY, as well as Ranking Member WALSH for their good work on this bill.

This bill, Madam Chairman, does a great deal in rejecting the President's cuts that would have provided $7.6 billion below last year's level in programs vital to protecting our Nation's health and education system.

This bill today, instead, provides a 3 percent increase over last year in areas such as family intervention, early learning, education and health care access. Let me tell you what that means. That means that we can help make a difference in averting the kinds of problems that will come later on, because now we will invest in prevention. Programs such as the SAMHSA, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration program, and Starting Early Starting Smart, which invests in family intervention, are so crucial. We know from the Adverse Childhood Experiences Study that the Kaiser Foundation did that families that are in crisis produce children that are at higher risk for not only delinquency but for drug abuse, for HIV, and for greater health care problems.

In this bill, we provide funds to go towards those families so that we can reach those parents. If we reach those parents, we reach those children. That, my friends, is what real family values are all about; it is reaching out to the families in this country in order to reach the children of this country. If we reach these children, they will be able to grow and prosper, and we as a Nation will be even stronger for it.

Madam Chairman, I thank the chairman for the work that he has done in helping to build a stronger safety net for the children of this country. It will make our country an even stronger place for all of us to live.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I reserve my time.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Madam Chairman, let me thank the chairman and our ranking member and our staff for their very diligent and brilliant work, really, in crafting this bipartisan bill. As a new member of the committee and the subcommittee, it has been a true honor to work with the chairman and our staff and our ranking member on this bill.

I must tell you, we had our work cut out for us because of the deep draconian cuts that the President proposed and because of the President's priorities of tax cuts for the rich and the invasion and occupation of Iraq. I am pleased that this bill rejects most of those cuts and makes the kinds of investments that recognize that an educated and skilled workforce and a healthy population are the backbone of our national security.

Let me highlight a few of these investments.

First, in the area of education, this bill invests in strengthening our minority-serving institutions by providing a $249.5 million for our Historically Black Colleges and Universities, which is an $11.4 million increase over FY 2007 levels, and also we increased by $4.5 million above FY 2007 the President's request for our Hispanic-serving institutions.

With regard to helping our low-income students go to college, we have increased TRIO and GEAR UP, which really do provide first generation college students the resources to enter and complete college.

With several universities in my district, we have increased the maximum Pell Grant, which will benefit millions of students which I know my district truly will benefit from.

On the issue of economic opportunity and a trained, skilled workforce, this bill reverses deep cuts in workforce training and requires the Secretary of Labor to provide a plan to address the huge dramatic disparities in unemployment in the African American and other communities of color.

We have increased, actually, by $100 million the Ryan White CARE Act, which, of course, is our HIV and AIDS funding.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I reserve my time.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), who is really not celebrating her birthday on the same day as the Baltimore Orioles.

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill, which makes needed investments in our family security and therefore our national security. I want to congratulate Chairman OBEY and Ranking Member WALSH for bringing forward a good bill, a bill that makes critical investments in America's families and in our country's future. This is my first year on the Appropriations Committee, and I am honored to have an opportunity to be part of this subcommittee.

The investments in this bill will affect every family in America. Today, we ensure our children have an opportunity for quality education, help families and students afford college, and increase access to community health clinics.

As Mr. OBEY says, this bill is about the country we want to be, and that is the country we deserve to be.

For too long the Bush administration has been negligent in its underfunding of education and health care, putting enormous strains on local governments, on schools and on local taxpayers. Today we move in a new direction by investing in families, prioritizing what matters: the education of our students, health care research in diabetes, cancer and heart disease, job training for those who are affected by our changing economy and for our returning veterans, energy assistance for our elderly, and early childhood education.

When we make responsible and necessary investments in our children and in our communities, we strengthen our families and we strengthen our Nation by ensuring our global competitiveness.

Once again, I thank Chairman OBEY for his leadership on the committee, for his commitment to strengthening America and bettering the lives of Americans.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman and I thank Mr. WALSH, the ranking member, for putting such a terrific bill together that is going to allow our Nation to compete in the global economy of the 21st century.

This bill makes investments in our kids, this bill makes investments in our workers, and this bill makes investments in American families. If our kids and our workers are healthy and educated, then we will be able to compete in the global economy.

I think it is important, just with this bill, if we look at what is going to happen next year when these investments hit, when students and workers are going to get a Pell Grant and it is $500 or $600 or $700 more for them. Tack that on to the education bill last week, where interest rates will be cut in half. Tack that on to the Energy and Water appropriations bill, where we are investing in our scientists and alternative energy research and we are creating new sectors of the economy so that we can compete in a global economy.

The anxiety that has been felt across this country over the last couple of years has been profound, and this bill helps address the challenges that American families have had. By reducing the cost of education, by making sure that we have community health clinics for people to go and take their kids, with the SCHIP program, this bill will have more to do with us being a competitive country in the next couple of decades, I think, than anything else we could possibly do.

So I would like to thank the chairman and ranking member and say that this is a bipartisan bill. This came out of the committee with the unanimous support of Democrats and Republicans, who agree that these investments needed to be made.

Madam Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman again and thank the Republicans for their support.

□ 1700

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

Mr. HINOJOSA. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the fiscal year 2008 Labor, HHS and Education appropriations bill that is before us today.

I would like to express my admiration and gratitude to Chairman OBEY and the members of the committee for bringing forward a bill that reflects our values and our commitment to investing in education.

As the chairman of the Higher Education Lifelong Learning and Competitiveness Subcommittee, I am pleased to see the significant increases for student financial aid, for GEAR UP and TRIO programs. These investments make a real difference, and they have not come a moment too soon.

Recent reports estimate that by the year 2025, just to keep pace with our international competitors, the United States would need to produce an additional 15.6 million college graduates. That translates to another 781,000 degrees per year. GEAR UP and TRIO help close the college awareness and readiness gap.

Pell Grants and campus-based student aid programs close the affordability gap. This legislation coupled with the recently passed budget reconciliation bill signal that we are serious about ensuring that our students have the education and the skills they need to compete.

As chairman of the Education Task Force for the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, I am particularly heartened to see the commitment in this bill to increase educational opportunities for Hispanic students. This legislation reverses the trend of the past of eliminating, cutting or at best flat-lining the key programs that provide the pillars of educational support to the Hispanic community. They include migrant education programs for English language learners, developing Hispanic-serving institutions, Even Start Family Literacy, GEAR UP, TRIO and adult education. Together, we call them the Hispanic education action plan.

In 2006, every single program in the Hispanic education action plan was reduced. Elections do make a difference.

For 2008, on top of the $1.5 billion increase to the core title I program in No Child Left Behind, we have over $212 million increases to the other programs, including a long overdue investment program for English language learners.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill. And in particular, I want to sincerely and deeply thank Chairman OBEY and Ranking Member WALSH on behalf of all New Yorkers and this Nation for providing the leadership to include for the first time much-needed money for the health care needs of the heroes and heroines of 9/11.

These rescue, recovery and cleanup workers selflessly rushed into the flames of 9/11 to save the lives of others. We lost 3,000 people on 9/11, but many thousands more lost their health. This bill includes $50 million for their treatment. This is the first time it has been part of an appropriations bill, and I deeply thank Chairman OBEY for working so hard to make this happen. In the past it has been tacked onto emergency spending and to the Iraq spending bill, but it is the least we can do to provide health care to these men and women.

Very importantly, the bill includes detailed language requiring the administration to develop and submit a long-term comprehensive plan to address these critical health needs. This is a tremendous step forward. I thank Chairman OBEY.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee. I have no further comments other than to say I enjoyed working with the chairman on this bill and his staff. I think we have a good work product here.

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

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

Frankly, Madam Chairman, I was filibustering in hopes that the majority leader would arrive, but he is in the middle of a meeting and can't make it. So let me simply second the comments of the gentleman from New York. I think this is a good bipartisan product. I think we can work with the Senate to produce a bill which people on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Capitol can support with pride.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chairman, I write today in opposition to the Weldon amendment to the Labor/HHS appropriations bill. This amendment would prohibit appropriated funds from being used to administer thimerosal-containing flu vaccine in the 2008–2009 flu season to children under 3.

This legislation is strongly opposed by a number of public health groups including the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Public Health Association, the Association of State and Territorial Health Officials, the National Association of County and City Health Officials, the Association of Maternal and Child Health Programs, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). According to public health officials, this language would pose real risks to public health, particularly to the youngest children who are most susceptible to the serious complications from flu, including death.

The American Academy of Pediatrics, in their letter opposing this amendment, assures us that there is scientific evidence that "the thimerosal in influenza vaccine is not a danger to health." The Institute of Medicine examined all of the available evidence on the association between thimerosal-containing vaccines and autism. In 2004 the IOM issued a report that concluded that the evidence was sufficient to say that thimerosal-containing vaccines do not cause autism.

Since that time there has been no new compelling evidence that would change the IOM's conclusion. In fact, because thimerosal has been removed from all other pediatric vaccines, children in the last 5 years have received much less thimerosal than they had in the 1990s, and yet autism rates continue to go up, not down.

The practical impact of the bill would be that the demand for thimerosal-free vaccine would exceed current production capacity. While technically the bill would prohibit only the youngest children who get Vaccines for Children vaccine from getting thimerosal-containing vaccine, the reality is that the message Congress would be sending to all parents is that the thimerosal-containing vaccine is less safe than the thimerosal-free vaccine. It is likely that most, if not all, parents would demand thimerosal-free vaccine for all of their children.

There are simply not enough doses of thimerosal-free vaccine to meet that kind of demand and it is unlikely that there would be for at least several years. Vaccine companies are moving to increase the production of thimerosal-free vaccines, but doing so requires building new facilities, or expanding existing facilities, and then going through a new FDA approval process.

Furthermore, there is currently only one company with a licensed thimerosal-free product for children under 3. If that company experienced production problems or delays in its thimerosal-free product, this would leave us without any vaccine for this population.

Even if there were sufficient vaccine to immunize all children under 3 with thimerosal-free vaccine, we have a private vaccine distribution system and there would be no way to ensure that each dose of thimerosal-free vaccine would be matched up with a child under 3. In recent years there have been shortages of flu vaccine. In order to make sure that those most susceptible to the flu get vaccinated, CDC has asked that vaccine be given first to priority groups, including very young children, the elderly, health care workers, and people with certain illnesses. Unfortunately, we have seen that this has not worked very well. There is no reason to believe that the system would work any better to make sure that the thimerosal-free vaccine goes first to children under 3.

In fact, there is nothing that would prevent one state from buying up all of the thimerosal-free vaccine for its population leaving the rest of the country without vaccine for the youngest children. That could cost lives. These are the children who are most susceptible to the serious complications from flu.

I urge Members to consider that this language could harm those very children the authors are trying to help. By restricting their access to flu vaccine, they will not prevent a single child from getting autism, but they may expose children to the very serious risks posed by influenza.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of the Labor, Health, Human Services and Education Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 2008. Overall, this is a very good bill, and I will vote for it. In this difficult fiscal environment, it provides funding for critical programs that have been starved by the Administration and the Republican Congress.

This bill provides significant increases for Education programs including resources for

teacher quality, early education and after school programs, and it provides more for Low Income Home Energy Assistance. It also provides important resources for preventive health care, for the title IIV and title IIIV Health professions training programs, and for the Ryan White program.

While I will support the bill, I am very disappointed that we were not able to provide more funding for the critical work conducted at the National Institutes of Health. The NIH embodies our country's hope for treating or curing debilitating diseases like heart disease, Alzheimer's, cystic fibrosis, diabetes, cancer and so many other illnesses that American families battle every day. But scientific advances don't just occur by accident. They are the result of sustained investments in research. Unfortunately, since 2003, Republicans flat-lined the NIH budget, and NIH has lost 13 percent of its research funding when adjusted for inflation.

I was hopeful that this year we would be able to end that devastating trend and get the NIH budget back on track by providing the NIH with significant increases over the rate of inflation.

Although I am disappointed that we were not able to provide more for NIH this year, I look forward to working with the distinguished chair and the members of the Appropriations committee in the future to ensure that we provide our country's premier medical research institution with the funding it needs to find treatments and cures to our country's most devastating diseases.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairman, in accordance with House earmark reforms, 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 the FY08 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations 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 report contains $300,000 for the Literacy Matters! Program administered by the Lee Pesky Learning Center in Boise. The Literacy Matters! Program is aimed at educating new mothers on the importance of early childhood literacy and math skills and providing them with resources for educating their children. The funding is used to provide every mother of a newborn in Idaho with a book created by the Lee Pesky Learning Center that helps them with teaching early literacy and math skills. The books are distributed through Idaho hospitals and the program has been highly successful. This is the second year of federal funding for the program.

This project was requested by the Lee Pesky Learning Center in Boise, Idaho.

The report contains $300,000 for the Idaho Caring Foundation's program to provide dental services to low-income, uninsured children who would otherwise have no access to such services. The program will provide access to needed dental care for 600 low-income, uninsured children throughout Idaho. Eligible children will be identified by working in partnership with Idaho schools, health departments, Head Start programs, and YMCA programs. Dental services will be provided by over 90 dentists who are Caring Foundation providers, providing oral health services for reduced fees. Federal funding is only a portion of the total costs of the program. As a dentist, I understand the importance of proper dental hygiene at a very young age. Serious health and self esteem problems can quickly evolve if dental hygiene is neglected early in a child's development. This is an outstanding program that enjoys my complete support. This is the second year of federal funding for the program.

This project was requested by the Idaho Caring Foundation in Boise, Idaho.

The report contains $250,000 for the Discovery Center of Idaho's new facility. The funding will assist with efforts initiated by the Discovery Center and the J.R. Simplot Foundation to build a new model of a ''hands-on'' science center to captivate the attention of and inspire tomorrow's leaders and innovators. The 70,000 square foot Center will be founded on three core strengths, inspiring stories of innovation including Mr. Simplot's story, iconic collection of working steam tractors and DCI's expertise in igniting curiosity, through interactive science exhibits and programs. The center will be a resource for the region, with particular interest in serving rural areas to help break the myth that innovation is a new urban phenomenon—that ingenuity is found wherever and whenever an observant creative human being has a problem to solve. This is a tremendous opportunity to create a new approach to bridging the gap in science and technology education. The $250,000 federal investment is a very small portion of what is expected to be a $40,000,000 project.

This project was requested by the Discovery Center of Idaho in Boise, Idaho.

The report contains $200,000 for the College of Southern Idaho's Pro-Tech Training Program which partners with local agencies and companies to identify training needs in the community and provide for those needs by training talented Idaho students. The College partners with other agencies to identify training needs and to identify potential candidates for employment. The most recent of these ventures are the training programs that were established for Dell Computers and its call center in Twin Falls. In addition, data provided by Region IV of the Idaho Economic Development Agency indicate that manufacturing will be a leading employment area in the Magic Valley with over 250 new jobs expected over the next two years.

This project was requested by the College of Southern Idaho in Twin Falls, Idaho.

The report contains $200,000 for St. Luke's Hospital's Children's Health Services Expansion. The Children's Health Services Expansion project provides essential growth in capacity for Pediatric Medical/Surgical, Pediatric Intensive Care, Neonatal Intensive Care, Pediatric Oncology, and Pediatric Surgical Suites and support areas, to meet the needs of the rapidly growing population in the hospital's service area. The hospital is spending millions on the expansion and federal funds will represent only a small portion of the project's total costs. This is the fourth year of federal funding for this program.

The project was requested by St. Luke's Regional Medical Center in Boise, Idaho.

The report contains $200,000 for Teton Valley Hospital and Surgicenter's Revitalization Project. Teton Valley Hospital & Surgicenter, a 13-bed Critical Access Hospital, provides an emergency room and a full scope of primary care services to the residents in and around Teton Valley, a rural community of just over 7,000 residents, nestled against the Teton Mountains in Southeast Idaho and Western Wyoming. Its population has grown by more than 99% over the past 15 years, ranking it in the top two fastest growing counties in Idaho for the last six years. This population growth has seriously strained the resources of the hospital and necessitated the revitalization project. Federal funds represent only a portion of the project's total costs.

This project was requested by Teton Valley Hospital & Surgicenter in Driggs, Idaho.

The report contains $200,000 for Madison County Memorial Hospital. Madison County Memorial Hospital services a growing area encompassing five counties and quite simply has outgrown its facilities. Increased capacity for obstetrics (Madison County Memorial Hospital has more births than any other hospital of its size in the State of Idaho and possibly the nation) and inpatient and outpatient surgeries are needed. The size of this project is 70,000 sq. feet of new construction and 85,000 sq. feet of remodeling, with an overall budget of $49 million and an equipment budget of over $7 million. Federal funding will be used for necessary medical equipment for the expanded and remodeled facility and represents a very small portion of the overall funding for this project.

This project was requested by Madison County Memorial Hospital in Rexburg, Idaho.

The report contains $400,000 for a Community Detox Center in Boise, Idaho. The need for a detox facility is both pressing and longstanding. According to a 2002 study by Boise State University's Center for Health Policy, rates of drug and alcohol abuse are worse in the Treasure Valley than in the rest of Idaho. Over 17,000 individuals in Ada and Canyon Counties were deemed at-risk for substance dependence in 2000, and the region severely lacks beds for detox patients, particularly those on limited incomes. To fill this void, hospital emergency rooms are acting as de facto drug and/ or alcohol detox centers which adds to rising health care costs. The proposed facility is a 24-hour medically monitored alcohol and drug sobering station and 36-bed detox center for indigent patients treated by a professional, qualified staff. Typical stays for sobering will be 12 hours and typical stays for detoxification will be 5-6 days; following sobering and/or detoxification, patients will be referred to appropriate education and treatment programs.

This project was requested by the United Way of Treasure Valley in Boise, Idaho.

The report contains $200,000 for the Advanced Clinical Simulation Laboratory at Idaho State University. This funding will be used to develop an Advanced Clinical Simulation Laboratory (ACSL) to strengthen nursing education, practice and research in Idaho. The ACLS will enable students, faculty, and practice partners to become actively involved in clinical simulation learning and conducting research related to student learning, effectiveness of clinical education models and improving patient care outcomes. The ACSL will also provide a research and practice laboratory for nurse faculty and clinical educators to learn and update knowledge about clinical educational models and teaching with technology.

This project was requested by Idaho State University in Pocatello, Idaho.

The report contains $200,000 for Idaho SySTEMic Solution: Plant Early for STEM

Learning (science, technology, engineering, and math) at Boise State University. Idaho SySTEMic Solution is a nationally relevant, hands-on, project-based STEM learning system (science, technology, engineering, and math) designed to spur achievement and confidence among elementary-age learners and their teachers. Key project components will include: (1) a comprehensive teacher training model that includes a one-week summer institute and ongoing site-based follow-up training to boost the ability and confidence of elementary teachers; (2) implementation into demographically diverse schools (grades 1–5/6, urban to suburban to rural, multicultural) of curriculum-aligned learning lab systems that have been shown to improve student scores in math, science, and technology; and (3) research and evaluation of results in accordance with Idaho and national assessment standards to maximize the effectiveness of transplanting this solution to other U.S. states.

This project was requested by Boise State University in Boise, Idaho.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide a list of Congressionally-directed projects in my region and an explanation of my support for them: (1) $300,000 for Early Literacy Matters, Lee Pesky Learning Center; (2) $300,000 for Idaho Caring Foundation Dental Project; (3) $200,000 for Children's Health Services Expansion; St. Luke's Regional Medical Center; (4) $400,000 for Community Detox Center, United Way of Treasure Valley; (5) $200,000 for Advanced Clinical Simulation Laboratory, Idaho State University; (6) $200,000 for Idaho SySTEMic Solution, Boise State University; (7) $200,000 for Madison County Memorial Hospital Revitalization Project; (8) $200,000 for College of Southern Idaho Pro-Tech Program, College of Southern Idaho; (9) $200,000 for Teton Valley Hospital Revitalization Project, Teton Valley Hospital; (10) $250,000 for the Discovery Center of Idaho Expansion, Discovery Center of Idaho.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Madam Chairman, I strongly support this bill to fund the departments of Labor, Health & Human Services, and Education.

I commend Chairman Obey and his staff on their hard work and dedication in putting together a bill that addresses the most pressing needs of American families, including their health and safety and the education of their children. I especially thank the Chairman for his efforts to increase funding for school counselors. This bill provides over $61 million for school counseling programs, a 77% increase over last year's funding. This historic investment will expand counseling in middle and high schools across the nation.

School counseling is a profession often treated as an afterthought in school improvement efforts. But counselors play a critical role, especially in high schools. High school is a transition period into adulthood and the world of work. As students make this transition, many lose their way and drop out. But a good counselor can help a student find the right path. No matter how many credits a student is behind or how many personal challenges she might face, counselors can help students at risk develop a plan, access the right help, and graduate on time.

Individual attention and follow-up from a counselor can help turn around students' lives. Additional counselors, particularly at the middle and high school levels, will be instrumental in helping schools improve their graduation rates and achieve other goals of No Child Left Behind.

Again, I thank the gentleman for his commitment to the education of our young people, and I encourage all my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. HONDA. Madam Chairman, I rise today to express my support for this bill and my deep appreciation for the leadership of Chairman OBEY in the crafting of this bill, the work of the committee staff, and the spirit of bi-partisanship that has marked our subcommittee and full committee proceedings on this bill.

Since being elected to Congress, I have worked hard to become a member of this committee and I find it especially gratifying to have had the opportunity to work on this bill. As Mr. OBEY is fond of saying, this is the people's bill. It funds the programs which are critical to the health and welfare of millions of my fellow Americans and I feel honored to be a part of taking this country in a new direction.

By rejecting the President's request that we cut critical labor, health, and education programs by $7.5 billion, and instead investing in targeted, carefully considered increases, this bill shows the American people Congress is serious about preserving and improving the social fabric of our nation.

Although I am disappointed that we were unable to more significantly increase the federal commitment to IDEA, I am glad that the committee protected the program from the President's proposed $291 million cut. I am particularly proud of the increases the bill makes to Title I—education for the disadvantaged, Title VII—health professions diversity programs, and CDC's Division of Viral Hepatitis.

The more than $4 billion increase in education funding contained in this bill is desperately needed if we are to continue to lead the world in the decades to come. Our students must have solid educational grounding to succeed in college but just as importantly, they must have the means to afford college. The $2 billion increase in Pell grants will go a long way toward making college a reality for many students.

As many of my colleagues know, I have been deeply involved in the effort to bring awareness to the problem of healthcare disparities. Communities of color suffer disproportionately from disparities in healthcare coverage, quality, and outcomes. The investments being made by this bill in Title VII Health Professions programs, particularly the increase in the diversity programs, are vital to increasing the pipeline of minority health professionals in underserved communities.

Finally, I would like to highlight the funding crisis that faces CDC's Division of Viral Hepatitis. The budget for this Division has remained almost flat since fiscal year 2002 and this has resulted in a serious curtailment of the Division's programs. There are an estimated 30 million people in the United States affected by a liver or liver related disease. Asian Americans face a near epidemic, with 1 out of 10 Asian American and Pacific Islanders infected with chronic hepatitis B. Included in the bill's 7.8 percent increase to the Centers for Disease control, is a $1 million increase for the Division of Viral Hepatitis. This appropriation begins a long overdue reversal of the inadequate budgets given to this Division since fiscal year 2002 and I would like to thank Chairman OBEY for acknowledging the need to rectify this situation.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman OBEY, Ranking Member WALSH, and all my other colleagues on the committee for their hard work and urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3043

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION

TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS)

For necessary expenses of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (''the Act''), and the Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations Act of 1992, including the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and other facilities, and the purchase of real property for training centers as authorized by the Act, $3,579,530,000, plus reimbursements, is available. Of the amounts provided:

(1) For grants to States for adult employment and training activities, youth activities, and dislocated worker employment and training activities, $2,994,510,000 as follows:

(A) $864,199,000 for adult employment and training activities, of which $152,199,000 is available for the period July 1, 2008, to June 30, 2009, and of which $712,000,000 is available for the period October 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009.

(B) $940,500,000 for youth activities, which shall be available for the period April 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009.

(C) $1,189,811,000 for dislocated worker employment and training activities, of which $341,811,000 is available for the period July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009, and of which $848,000,000 is available for the period October 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the transfer limitation under section 133(b)(4) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2863(B)(4)), up to 30 percent of such funds may be transferred by a local board if approved by the Governor.

(2) For federally administered programs, $483,213,000 as follows:

(A) $282,092,000 for the dislocated workers assistance national reserve, of which $2,600,000 is available on October 1, 2007, of which $67,492,000 is available for the period July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009, and of which $212,000,000 is available for the period October 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009: *Provided*, That up to $125,000,000 may be made available for Community-Based Job Training

grants: *Provided further*, That funds provided to carry out section 132(a)(2)(A) of the Act (29 U.S.C. 2862(A)(2)(a)) may be used to provide assistance to a State for State-wide or local use in order to address cases where there have been worker dislocations across multiple sectors or across multiple local areas and such workers remain dislocated; coordinate the State workforce development plan with emerging economic development needs; and train such eligible dislocated workers: *Provided further*, That funds provided to carry out section 171(d) of the Act (29 U.S.C. 2916 (d)) may be used for demonstration projects that provide assistance to new entrants in the workforce and incumbent workers: *Provided further*, That $2,600,000 shall be for a noncompetitive grant to the National Center on Education and the Economy, which shall be awarded not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) $56,381,000 for Native American programs, which shall be available for the period July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009.

(C) $83,740,000 for migrant and seasonal farmworkers under section 167 of the Act (29 U.S.C. 2912), of which $78,740,000 is for formula grants (of which not less that 70 percent shall be for employment and training services) and $5,000,000 is for migrant and seasonal housing (of which not less than 70 percent shall be for permanent housing), which shall be available for the period July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009.

(D) $60,000,000 for YouthBuild activities under section 173A of the Act (29 U.S.C. 2918a), which shall be available for the period April 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009.

(E) $1,000,000 for carrying out the Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations Act (29 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), which shall be available for the period July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009.

(3) For national activities, $101,807,000, which shall be available for the period July 1, 2008, through July 30, 2009, as follows:

(A) $68,746,000 for ex-offender activities, under the authority of section 171 of the Act (29 U.S.C. 2916), notwithstanding the requirements of sections 171(b)(2)(B) or 171(c)(4)(D) of such section, of which not less than $48,000,000 shall be for youthful offender activities.

(B) $28,140,000 for Pilots, Demonstrations, and Research (notwithstanding the requirements of sections 171(b)(2)(B) or 171(c)(4)(D) of the Act (29 U.S.C. 2916(b)(2)(B) or (c)(4)(D)), of which $10,000,000 shall be for grants to address the employment and training needs of young parents.

(C) $4,921,000 for Evaluation under the authority of section 172 of the Act (29 U.S.C. 2917).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCKEON

Mr. McKEON. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McKEON:

Page 2, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $43,746,000)''.

Page 5, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $43,746,000)''.

Page 5, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $43,746,000)''.

Page 6, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $48,000,000)''.

Page 63, line 4, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $8,484,000)''.

Page 77, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $75,000,000)''.

Page 77, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $75,000,000)''.

Page 87, line 5, after the first dollar amount and after the second dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $22,770,000)''.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McKEON. Madam Chairman, my amendment would restore much-needed funding to the highly successful Reading First program.

In 2001, Members of both parties committed to implementing scientifically based reading instruction, through Reading First, as the foundation of an effort to provide a high-quality education in every school. Six years later, it is clear that the program is working, but not without some internal challenges.

Indeed, Reading First has received a great deal of attention over the last several months, and for good reason. An investigation into the program by the Department of Education's Inspector General uncovered real problems in the agency's implementation and management of the program. And the Education and Labor Committee has followed with appropriate, thorough, and bipartisan oversight to ensure that those problems are addressed.

In spite of this, we have heard from the majority that it intends to cut some $600 million from this program, roughly 60 percent of its overall annual budget, until problems identified by the Inspector General have been addressed. That's particularly interesting since these problems have been and are being addressed both by the Department of Education itself and through proposed legislation.

Since last September, the Department has responded to the investigation of its Inspector General and to our committee's oversight of Reading First by making a number of significant changes to improve the administration of the program. In fact, at the committee's oversight hearing of this program, the Inspector General acknowledged that the Department has accepted his recommendations and begun implementing them to reform the program.

Among the steps taken by the Department in the wake of this investigation include: Replacing the internal Reading First program management; reconstituting a key peer review panel used in the program to ensure fairness and more openness in its review processes; and providing additional guidance to contractors and subcontractors to enhance the objectivity and effectiveness of their services.

In order to codify many of these recommendations made by the Inspector General and reform steps taken by the Department earlier this year, I joined my committee colleague, Mr. CASTLE, in introducing the Reading First Improvement Act. Instead of slashing funding for this highly successful program, I call on my friends on the other side of the aisle to enact this legislation to ensure permanent and longstanding reform to Reading First.

To date, the bill has seen no action, not in subcommittee, not in full committee, and not on the floor. To think that we are cutting this program's budget by more than 60 percent when a measure to reform it is sitting right before us demonstrates how truly politically driven the majority's actions are on Reading First and continue to be.

Nonetheless, it is clear to any fair-minded person that the management problems of Reading First are in the past. What is equally clear is that Reading First, despite past problems, has been an unqualified success for the students it is intended to serve. Indeed, my friend, the distinguish chairman of our committee said during our oversight hearing of Reading First earlier this year, ''The purpose of this hearing is not to evaluate the effectiveness or strengths or weaknesses of the Reading First program. I support the Reading First program, as do many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.''

Statistics bear out the chairman's and my own continued support for Reading First. For example, data released earlier this year shows that in Reading First schools, the percentage of first graders meeting or exceeding proficiency on fluency outcome measures increased by 14 percentage points, from 43 to 57 percent, from 2004 to 2006, with the percentage of third graders increasing by 7 percent during the same period of time.

And a 2006 Center on Education Policy survey found that 97 percent of school districts which reported increases in student achievement indicated that Reading First was a key reason for this progress.

Madam Chairman, rather than taking into consideration this data and the improvements that the Department has made in its implementation of Reading First, the majority has decided it is better to make a political statement against the administration than to provide the critical resources needed to continue to address the needs of our most disadvantaged young students.

By finding some $75 million in savings through reducing administrative costs at the Department of Health and Human Services and implementing programs for prisoners that the President did not request funding for, while keeping intact his faith-based prisoner reentry initiative, my amendment restores some of these resources.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

Madam Chairman, I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman who just offered the amendment, but I have to say this is exactly the wrong thing for the Congress to do at this time.

The gentleman's amendment tries to restore $75 million to probably the most troubled program in this bill. As the gentleman has indicated, we have had six different audits by the Office of Inspector General. He has discovered that the Department of Education

tried to steer billions of dollars in Reading First funds for the purchase of certain reading textbooks and assessments in order to benefit favored publishers and individuals. I don't think the Congress ought to stand for that.

I would also point out that the OIG found out that the Department of Education administrators improperly promoted commercial reading programs in potential violation of Federal law. And this did not just occur in my own State, as I mentioned earlier in my remarks, it occurred in Illinois, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, New Jersey. States in districts with programs that were not on the Department's preferential list were either rejected for grants or pressured to change their methods, even though some argued, as did my own State, that their programs met the law's standard.

What is most ironic is this is supposed to be a peer reviewed program, and yet the programs that have demonstrably shown the best performance levels were frozen out of the program, including Bob Slaven's program at Johns Hopkins that has generally been reviewed as one of the best in the country. Yet, they were virtually invited out the door by the DOE.

In addition to the fact that we certainly should not be rewarding the administration for the way they have handled this program, the gentleman seeks to finance this program by taking $43 million out of job training for ex-offenders. We cannot afford to have criminals reentering society with inadequate job training that provides them with incentives to renew their lives of crime.

□ 1715

We need to provide as much training as possible, and the gentleman scales that back dramatically.

And, lastly, I must confess I'm a bit confused. In the full committee, I accepted an amendment from Mr. PETERSON, a valued member of our subcommittee, who wanted to add $25 million for vocational education above my mark. I accepted it because I thought he made a good case. Now we're being asked to take out $23 million of the money that Mr. PETERSON successfully added in the subcommittee. I don't think that's a wise thing to do.

There will be plenty of time in conference to restore funding for Reading First, provided that the administration and provided that the agency demonstrates that it's shaped up and it's no longer following the same habits. But at this point, you have the same contractors still in place, you have the same conflicts still at large, and I don't think under these circumstances that this Congress wants to support the kind of shenanigans that we've seen in that Reading First program. And, on behalf of the integrity of the taxpayers' dollar, I would urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Of the amounts made available under this heading in Public Law 107–116 to carry out the activities of the National Skill Standards Board, $44,000 is rescinded.

Of the unexpended balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Labor under this heading for fiscal years 2006 and prior years, $335,000,000 is rescinded.

COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT FOR OLDER AMERICANS

To carry out title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965, $530,900,000, which shall be available for the period July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, I would like to engage the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate all your efforts in bringing this bill forward and thank you for your continued support of the Nation's chartered schools, which increase the academic achievement of our Nation's most low-income students. I wanted to clarify the committee's intent to fund the Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities program, which received $36.6 million last year. This year, the committee chose to increase funding to the Charter School Grant program and folded the Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities program into this larger program.

Charter schools are public schools created by teachers, parents and other community stakeholders to educate students of all backgrounds and educational abilities. In exchange for greater accountability for student achievement, these schools are free from many local and State regulations. This flexibility and accountability has allowed individuals with nontraditional backgrounds to create cultures that have made charter schools top academic performers, often in some of the Nation's largest urban centers. Because of this unique approach to education, demand for these schools has been remarkable over the last decade.

Unlike other local school districts, however, public charter schools cannot levy property or other taxes for building and infrastructure. Thus, public charter schools must pay for their facilities from their operating budgets, which are smaller than those received by their conventional K–12 peers. In fact, locating suitability facilities remains the greatest challenge faced by charter schools.

The Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities program provides vital assistance to help charter schools meet their local facility needs. Under this program, funds are provided on a competitive basis to public and nonprofit entities, and consortia of those entities, to leverage other funds and help charter schools obtain school facilities through such means as purchase, lease and donation. Grantees may also use grants to leverage funds to help charter schools construct and renovate school facilities.

Was it the intent of the chairman to continue funding for the Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities program, as part of the Charter School programs and at their fiscal year 2007 levels?

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCKEON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his question.

Yes, it was our intent to fund both the Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities program within the larger Charter School Grant program at their fiscal year 2007 levels, not to eliminate the credit enhancement program. We consolidated the programs for administrative efficiency and fully expect the Secretary of Education to continue funding for existing charter school programs from this single line item.

Mr. MCKEON. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his clarification and again appreciate his continued support for charter schools.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS AND ALLOWANCES

For payments during fiscal year 2008 of trade adjustment benefit payments and allowances under part I of subchapter B of chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, and section 246 of that Act; and for training, allowances for job search and relocation, and related State administrative expenses under Part II of subchapter B of chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, $888,700,000, together with such amounts as may be necessary to be charged to the subsequent appropriation for payments for any period subsequent to September 15, 2008.

STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OPERATIONS

For authorized administrative expenses, $85,945,000, together with not to exceed $3,256,669,000 which may be expended from the employment security administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund (''the Trust Fund''), of which—

(1) $2,510,723,000 from the Trust Fund is for grants to States for the administration of State unemployment insurance laws as authorized under title III of the Social Security Act (including $10,000,000 to conduct in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments in one-stop career centers of claimants of unemployment insurance), the administration of unemployment insurance for Federal employees and for ex-service members as authorized under sections 8501–8525 of title 5, United States Code, and the administration of trade readjustment allowances and alternative trade adjustment assistance under the Trade Act of 1974, and shall be available for obligation by the States through December 31, 2008, except that funds used for automation acquisitions shall be available for obligation by the States through September 30, 2010, and funds used for unemployment insurance workloads experienced by the States through September

30, 2008, shall be available for Federal obligation through December 31, 2008;

(2) $10,500,000 from the Trust Fund is for national activities necessary to support the administration of the Federal-State unemployment insurance system;

(3) $23,203,000, together with $702,680,000 from the Trust Fund, is for grants to States in accordance with section 6 of the Wagner-Peyser Act, and shall be available for Federal obligation for the period July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009;

(4) $32,766,000 from the Trust Fund is for national activities of the Employment Service, including administration of the work opportunity tax credit under section 51 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the administration of activities, including foreign labor certifications, under the Immigration and Nationality Act, and the provision of technical assistance and staff training under the Wagner-Peyser Act, including not to exceed $1,228,000 that may be used for amortization payments to States which had independent retirement plans in their State employment service agencies prior to 1980;

(5) $52,985,000 is to provide workforce information, national electronic tools, and one-stop system building under the Wagner-Peyser Act and shall be available for Federal obligation for the period July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009; and

(6) $9,757,000 is to provide for work incentive grants to the States and shall be available for the period July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009:

Provided, That to the extent that the Average Weekly Insured Unemployment (''AWIU'') for fiscal year 2008 is projected by the Department of Labor to exceed 2,786,000, an additional $28,600,000 from the Trust Fund shall be available for obligation for every 100,000 increase in the AWIU level (including a pro rata amount for any increment less than 100,000) to carry out title III of the Social Security Act: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this Act that are allotted to a State to carry out activities under title III of the Social Security Act may be used by such State to assist other States in carrying out activities under such title III if the other States include areas that have suffered a major disaster declared by the President under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this Act which are used to establish a national one-stop career center system, or which are used to support the national activities of the Federal-State unemployment insurance or immigration programs, may be obligated in contracts, grants, or agreements with non-State entities: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this Act for activities authorized under title III of the Social Security Act and the Wagner-Peyser Act may be used by States to fund integrated unemployment insurance and Employment Service automation efforts, notwithstanding cost allocation principles prescribed under the Office of Management and Budget Circular A–87.

Mr. HONDA. Madam Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with both the chairman and ranking member on a recent CMS proposed national coverage decision on ESAs.

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

Mr. HONDA. Madam Chairman, I'd like to thank the chairman and ranking member for this opportunity.

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, CMS, has proposed a national coverage decision memorandum for the use of erythropoiesis stimulating agents, ESAs, in cancer and related neoplastic conditions. Recent concerns have been raised by both CMS and the Food and Drug Administration about the use of ESAs in treating anemia that results from chemotherapy.

The FDA is currently conducting its own scientific review of the issues. These concerns may be valid for many patients treated with ESAs, but as the FDA noted, they do not apply to all individuals treated for chemotherapy-induced anemia or bone marrow failure diseases.

I would ask the chairman to work with me during conference to preserve the Senate language requesting that CMS delay finalizing the proposed decision memo for ESAs for non-renal disease indications until after the FDA has completed its current scientific review.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HONDA. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I understand the gentleman's concern, and I'm surprised that CMS would consider issuing a final decision when the FDA has not completed its scientific review. I would certainly be happy to work with the gentleman during conference on the issue.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I'm also concerned about the matter raised by the gentleman from California. I understand that the Senate Appropriations Committee has included some language dealing with this issue in its committee report. I can assure the gentleman that we'll continue to work on this matter as we conference the bill.

Mr. HONDA. Thank you. I thank the chairman and ranking member.

Madam Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In addition, $40,000,000 from the employment security administration account of the Unemployment Trust Fund shall be available to conduct in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments in one-stop career centers of claimants of unemployment insurance: *Provided*, That not later than 180 days following the end of the fiscal year 2008, the Secretary shall submit an interim report to the Congress that includes available information on expenditures, number of claimants assessed, and outcomes from the assessments: *Provided further*, That not later than 18 months following the end of the fiscal year, the Secretary of Labor shall submit to the Congress a final report containing comprehensive information on the estimated savings that result from the assessments of claimants and identification of best practices.

ADVANCES TO THE UNEMPLOYMENT TRUST FUND AND OTHER FUNDS

For repayable advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund as authorized by sections 905(d) and 1203 of the Social Security Act, and to the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund as authorized by section 9501(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; and for nonrepayable advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund as authorized by section 8509 of title 5, United States Code, and to the ''Federal unemployment benefits and allowances'' account, to remain available until September 30, 2009, $437,000,000.

In addition, for making repayable advances to the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund in the current fiscal year after September 15, 2008, for costs incurred by the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund in the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

For expenses of administering employment and training programs, $88,451,000, together with not to exceed $82,049,000, which may be expended from the employment security administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

EMPLOYEE BENEFITS SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Employee Benefits Security Administration, $142,925,000.

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION FUND

The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation is authorized to make such expenditures, including financial assistance authorized by subtitle E of title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 4201 et seq.), within limits of funds and borrowing authority available to such Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 9104), as may be necessary in carrying out the program, including associated administrative expenses, through September 30, 2008, for such Corporation: *Provided*, That none of the funds available to the Corporation for fiscal year 2008 shall be available for obligations for administrative expenses in excess of $411,151,000: *Provided further*, That to the extent that the number of new plan participants in plans terminated by the Corporation exceeds 100,000 in fiscal year 2008, an amount not to exceed an additional $9,200,000 shall be available for obligation for administrative expenses for every 20,000 additional terminated participants: *Provided further*, That an additional $50,000 shall be made available for obligation for investment management fees for every $25,000,000 in assets received by the Corporation as a result of new plan terminations, after approval by the Office of Management and Budget and notification of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For necessary expenses for the Employment Standards Administration, including reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspection services rendered, $434,397,000, together with $2,111,000 which may be expended from the Special Fund in accordance with sections 39(c), 44(d) and 44(j) of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Labor is authorized to establish and, in accordance with section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, collect and deposit in the Treasury fees for processing applications and issuing certificates under sections 11(d) and 14 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 211(d)

and 214) and for processing applications and issuing registrations under title I of the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act (29 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KLINE OF MINNESOTA

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KLINE of Minnesota:

Page 13, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,016,000)''.

Page 25, line 22, after each dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam Chairman, my amendment is very simple.

The committee bill cuts the Office of Labor Management Standards, known as OLMS, down to fiscal 2006 levels. My amendment would restore just over $2 million to get this enforcement agency back to its fiscal 2007 level. To offset the increase for OLMS, we have reduced the International Labor Organization earmark from the International Labor Affairs Bureau by the requisite amount.

What is OLMS and why I am taking to the floor of the House to make a $2 million adjustment in this small agency? That's a fair question.

Without this amendment, the OLMS will have to cut staff. OLMS is the agency within the Department of Labor's Employment Standards Administration that enforces the Labor Management Reporting Disclosure Act of 1959. This Federal statute was championed by then-Senator John F. Kennedy and enacted as an outcome of the McCollum hearing on labor racketeering.

Then-Senator Kennedy knew, as we affirm today, that rank-and-file union members deserve the right to know how their unions were spending and investing their members' dues money; that their unions' books were clean; and that elections for union officers would be fair and free of intimidation or scandal.

Do labor unions need a government watchdog? Apparently so. Since 2001, OLMS has helped obtain 750 convictions and restitution of over $70 million for union members in criminal cases of embezzlement and election irregularities.

Some of my colleagues may dismiss these monetary results as just small change compared to the billions of assets held by labor unions, but they miss the point. Stealing from your fellow union members is against the law, regardless of whether the theft is $10,000 or $100,000. And anywhere in the country but Washington, D.C., $10,000 is a lot of money.

OLMS functions like the Securities and Exchange Commission for labor unions. Why should rank-and-file union members not be protected in the same way as individual shareholders of corporations? Senator Paul Sarbanes agreed. During the debate on the Sarbanes-Oxley legislation in 2002, he argued that if union financial disclosure and accountability was already required by law and wasn't being funded, he suggested that the Department of Labor request the money from Congress.

Madam Chairman, DOL is not only being denied the increase it asked for; it is being cut to the bone. Federal law requires financial transparency and disclosure from corporations, pension plans, lobbyists and Members of Congress. Why would we not enforce the one law on the books that enables rank-and-file union members to review the financial expenditures of their unions?

I find it ironic, Madam Chairman, that the House Financial Services Appropriations Subcommittee provided $3.1 million over the administration's budget request for the SEC, while OLMS was being cut below fiscal year 2007 levels. Clearly, we put a high priority on corporate accountability. We need to put the same high priority on union accountability.

Although this is a modest amendment, it will enable this enforcement agency within the Department of Labor to maintain its audit program and other activities under the Labor Management Reporting Disclosure Act. I cannot believe that this House would say to union members throughout America that we do not support your right to know and your right to union integrity.

I urge all Members to vote for this amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. OBEY. Let me say simply say, Madam Chairman, that the fund that the gentleman seeks to increase has been increased by 33 percent in terms of resources just over the last 4 years, and staffing for that same agency has been increased by over 25 percent. That is hardly starving an agency.

I would also point out that at the same time you've had those large increases, the wage and hour division, which is supposed to enforce protection for workers on minimum wage, overtime and child labor laws, will have seen its staffing drop by over 12 percent since 2001, and the staff level at the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, which protects workers from unfair employment practices by Federal contractors, will have dropped by 23 percent.

So it seems to me that what the gentleman's amendment does is to enrich the one portion of the Labor Department which has been doing very well, thank you, and they have been doing very well while other portions of the Labor Department that are supposed to focus on protecting workers have, in fact, been starved.

The Department's own budget justifications for the large increase that they've requested states that the acceptability rate for unions in meeting labor management reporting and disclosure reporting requirements is at 96 percent.

□ 1730

The goal for fiscal 2008 is to raise this to 97 percent. I'd say if you are getting 96 percent, that's an A. At least it was when I went to school. Things may have changed since then.

Let me also say that the place that this funding was taken from, in order to finance this increase is especially pernicious. The administration itself has asked for an 81 percent reduction in the International Labor Account. That is the program that is used in order to protect workers from having to compete against slave labor and child labor.

I don't think that you help workers by weakening that program. We are simply trying to restore funding in that program that the President cut, and I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of Mr. KLINE's amendment to restore funding for the Labor Department's Office of Labor Management Standards to its fiscal year 2007 level.

A column published in Wall Street Journal's Opinion Journal noted today that Congress has added $935 million to President Bush's fiscal year 2008 budget request for the Department of Labor. Within that budget increase are individual funding increases for every single enforcement agency within the agency; that is, except for one.

The appropriations measure before us cuts the Office of Labor Management Standards' budget $2 million below its fiscal 2007 funding level and more than $10 million below the President's budget request for the office this year.

Identifying OLMS as the only enforcement office at the Department of Labor to have its budget cut is significant. In fact, it was clearly singled out by design.

Why? Perhaps it's because the office has had such great success in protecting rank-and-file union members. Consider this, since 2001, OLMS has helped obtain over 750 convictions and restitution of over $70 million in criminal cases of embezzlement, election irregularities and violations of union members' rights.

Last week, for example, a union financial secretary in Michigan pleaded guilty to falsifying union reports. Earlier this year, a former union president in Texas was sentenced to 6½ years in prison for embezzling dues paid by hard-working union members. These are the types of results Congress expected when it passed the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959.

This law makes clear that a union member must have access to union financial records and has the right to recover misappropriated union assets on

behalf of the union when the union fails to do so itself.

Nearly 50 years later, and with more than 15 million American workers contributing a portion of every paycheck they earn to labor organizations, we should demand nothing less than what we demanded in 1959. Indeed, Congress expects the Securities and Exchange Commission to protect the interests of shareholders, and so too must we expect the OLMS to protect the interests of rank-and-file union members.

The amendment before us would restore $2 million to the OLMS budget, bringing it back to the fiscal year 2007 level and ensuring it has the resources its needs to safeguard union transparency and accountability. Indeed, if my colleagues believe, as I do, that transparency is the key protection against financial misconduct, then we should take OLMS off the political chopping block by restoring its funds.

I thank my Education and Labor Committee colleague, Mr. KLINE, for offering the amendment.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of it.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Chairman, I find it very ironic from the other side that they are so outraged about these cuts. This is an account within the Department of Labor that has seen a 33 percent increase over the last several Congresses, a 33 percent increase within this specific account of the Department of Labor.

Now let's put that in perspective to what the Republicans put into other accounts within the Department of Labor. I seem to recall the International Child Labor Inspection in the last several Congresses was cut repeatedly over the last several Congresses, up to 87 percent.

This is the International Labor Organization's duty to oversee child labor standards to ensure that our competitors are not using children in the conduct of labor when competing with us and our manufacturing process. Yet it was good enough for us to cut 87 percent of the inspection for child labor, but good enough for us to increase the 33 percent.

Now we hear a complaint that somehow it's not good enough for us to just, since the account has done very well, to just keep it as it's going. Now there is a big outrage about this.

I might add, where was the outrage when the 12 percent cut was for the wage and hour department? Where was that? I didn't hear any outrage. Where was the outrage for the compliance for the contractors? I didn't hear any outrage for that.

It's just interesting, when we hear these complaints about where the cuts are, let's find out where the priorities really are. I think we are hearing them. They are not with the children and child labor. They are not with the workers and the wage and hour inspections, and they are not with the contractors and making sure that they are protected on the job.

They are here going after, once again, people who are trying to earn a living. I think that's a very clear set of priorities in this Department of Labor account.

Mr. PUTNAM. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PUTNAM. Madam Chairman, I think the gentleman from Rhode Island must have misspoken when he said we were here to ''go after the workers.''

I want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota for sponsoring this amendment which, to the contrary, seeks to protect American union dues-paying workers.

We live in an era of instant information, almost universal access to information. We are in a period, a legislative period on the heels of Sarbanes-Oxley, which brought unprecedented new auditing requirements and penalties for noncompliance for publicly traded companies.

We live in a legislative era of McCain-Feingold, which brought unprecedented penalties, accountability, auditing to public office holders who accept campaign contributions to seek elective office, but then have to disclose to a greater detail than ever before, and subject to greater limits than ever before, for the sole purpose of having the public understand who was supporting that particular campaign.

So in this era, in this trend of greater openness, greater accountability, easier access for the public to be able to understand how their money is being spent, and who is the money behind individuals, behind candidates, behind corporations, enter the Democratic appropriations bill which guts the ability for America to understand who is behind the money in big labor and how are individual hard-working chemical workers', steelworkers', teachers', manufacturers' dues being spent by those public unions and private unions?

Here is an amendment that takes the level of this agency's funding. It doesn't freeze it, it doesn't cut it by single digits. It takes it all the way back to the 2006 level and is a 20 percent cut.

My friend and colleague from Minnesota seeks to correct that situation by replacing the money that otherwise would be going to a United Nations organization and puts it to help American workers. American taxpayers understand how American union dues are being spent.

This agency has a proven track record. It gets results. This amendment allows it to continue on that path of auditing and getting results so that they can do better than the 4½ percent audit rate, which was all they were able to muster under the existing funding levels that they had been enjoying.

Union members have a right to know how their dollars are being spent. Union Members have a right to know how their dollars are being spent, and clearly the curiosity is there. There is a proven track record of them seeking to know how their dollars are being spent.

In fact, there were over 760,000 hits on the OLMS Web site just for that purpose, an average of over 2,100 hits per day for people seeking the information that will not be available at the desired rate and at the desired accuracy if this amendment is not adopted. It is critical that we adopt the Kline amendment so that hard-working men and women across America can see how their hard-earned dollars are being spent.

Why, in this era of greater openness, for political candidates, for executives, for publicly traded companies, why in this era of ever more complicated regulations, ever more detailed tax returns, are we letting unions off the hook? There is a trend here.

It began on this House floor over great resistance on this side of the aisle, rolled back fundamental privacy, the fundamental right to a secret ballot that hard-working union members had been enjoying, that hard-working Americans had been enjoying when they decided they want to unionize. Here we find ourselves today taking an additional step, and it's wrong.

Adopt the Kline amendment.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. KENNEDY. Let me just say to the gentleman from Florida, I find it curious that he says he is standing up for workers, because he must not recall his party gutting workers' overtime pay. I don't know whether he recalls that his party was for flex time.

Make sure every worker out there understands the Republican Party passed flex time. That means that your overtime pay, America, is gone. They passed it. They are not for working people. They said, if you work overtime, that it wasn't counting as overtime pay, and that that overtime pay towards your pension didn't get calculated to your overtime pension. So don't say you are on the side of workers.

I suppose that when you were for OSHA reform, that you are for workers, right? Reform in your view meant inspection was voluntary. That's really standing up for workers, making it so that the employer, all they had to do is, you know, check their own book to say whether they were protecting workers' heads or not from scaffolding or for those chemical plants that you mentioned, whether they were safe or not.

They didn't have to worry about covering their tracks. They didn't have any tracks to cover any more under

your bill for OSHA reform. As far as other bills, NLRB, forget it. You guys threw that out the window with the TEAM Act. There is no negotiating for unions.

So don't stand up here and talk about how you guys like to protect workers under this phony premise that you want to see more transparency and compliance. That's just a lot of hogwash.

In terms of international labor standards, if you don't understand the connection between slave labor abroad and workers here at home, I am sorry, you don't understand globalization.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind Members to direct all comments to the Chair, please.

Mr. KENNEDY. If the gentleman doesn't understand, through the Chairman, doesn't understand the comparison between children working overseas, fighting, working to try to manufacture products that are going to compete against our unionized workers here at home or our manufacturer workers, whether they are unionized or not, if he doesn't understand that they are competing against one another, I can't explain it to them.

If he can't understand and grasp that it's in our interest to make sure that our competitors don't use children that are being paid pennies on the dollar while our moms and pops are having to compete against them with minimum wage standards, I can't explain it to him. If he doesn't understand that, it's hard for me to give him an economics lesson that they are competing in a global economy that has transparency of products thanks to these trade agreements.

□ 1745

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island. And I also find it a bit peculiar that our friend from Florida, being from Ohio, we disagree on our favorite college basketball team, we disagree on our favorite college football team, so it is not a real surprise that we are going to disagree here. But I find it peculiar that he was saying that he was trying to support the workers. And I wish he would remember the vote on the minimum wage when he and the leadership of his party were consistently trying to prevent us from passing the minimum wage to help the American worker.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank my friend from Minnesota for bringing this issue forward. Madam Chairman, this is an extremely important issue, and I think it is important that we bring the debate back to the actual amendment.

The amendment addresses the issue of funding for the Office of Labor Management Statistics, and that agency is the only agency of the government that is devoted to protecting the interests of dues-paying union members, the only one.

The funding in last year, fiscal year 2007, was about $47 million. Funding proposed for this year is about $45 million. It is a cut of about $2 million. That is a cut. Not the cut that we have heard explained in other bills that were reductions in the increase; it is a cut. The President felt so strongly about this and felt so strongly about the success of this agency that he recommended an increase to $56 million. So this proposal by the majority party is a decrease of $11.1 million from the President's request.

Now, it is curious the arguments that we are hearing on the other side. They have increased spending virtually across the board for every single agency except for this one, and this is the one that provides the enforcement for the Department of Labor. I have supported many appropriate reductions, there is no doubt about it, as we have moved through these appropriations bills, but I believe strongly that there is a message that is being sent in this cut that is being proposed by the majority party, and that message is that it is imperative that the debt that they owe to union bosses be paid.

And why do I say that? This is an agency that has significant results. Since 2001, the indictments resulting from investigations by this agency have increased by 20 percent. Now, why would we want to decrease funding to an agency that is showing success in protecting dues-paying workers? Convictions have increased by 26 percent and the courts have ordered restitution of over $70 million in union members' dues that were stolen, stolen by union officials. That sounds like a project that would merit support by the majority party, but, as my good friend from Florida just said, it is clear that this is a trend that we are seeing by this new majority party, and that is that the protection of the rank-and-file worker is not what they have an interest in. And that was demonstrated clearly with the card check issue which, as he mentioned, took away the sacrosanct right of a secret ballot in union formation in this Nation. The majority party said, no, that wasn't important, that individuals ought to be exposed to the kind of intimidation that we see on both sides, both the employer and the union side.

So, Madam Chairman, I guess it ought not be surprising that we see this included in the current bill, but it is disappointing. There is no doubt that it is disappointing. Because, again, we have an agency of the Federal Government, the Office of Labor Management Statistics, which is getting results, which is fulfilling its mission, which is fulfilling its charge, which is fulfilling its responsibility to the American people and to this Federal Government, and this new majority proposes to significantly cut the amount of funding to the agency. I think it exposes a flaw in the thinking of the majority party and, hence, this general statement that we are the only individuals for working people. In fact, tax cuts are for working people. In fact, decreasing spending at the level of the Federal Government is for working people. In fact, not passing the largest tax increase in the history of our Nation is for working people.

So we stand proudly and honorably before the American people and say that the party that stands in favor of working people is the party that is most responsible with Federal spending. It is the party that holds to account Federal agencies. This Federal agency, this office is accomplishing its goal, it is accomplishing its mission, and so it ought not be one that we cut. There are certainly others that are available to be decreased. I urge support of the Kline amendment and ask all my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MARCHANT. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. MARCHANT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There are a couple of points I would like to address. It has been an interesting debate, as these things often turn in to be. We have heard the gentleman from Rhode Island say that this base bill just keeps it going presumably at the current level. And, as we have already heard established, this is in fact a $2 million cut, $11 million below the President's request.

The gentleman from Rhode Island is right, though, when he talked about this being about people checking their own books and covering their tracks. That is exactly what this is about. He was talking about perhaps corporations, and we have already talked about increasing the money to provide oversight and law enforcement for corporations. But this is about unions. This is about American workers.

We have looked at the money percentage cut/percentage increase. We have already confirmed that this is a $2 million cut, as my colleague from Georgia says. And I just find it interesting, looking at the figures here, we have added $935 million to President Bush's fiscal year 2008 budget request for the Department of Labor, and within that budget increase are individual funding increases for every single enforcement office within the agency except this one, this one whose job it is to make sure that union leaders who are misbehaving are not able to just check their own books and cover their tracks. Somebody else has got to hold them accountable.

And this embezzlement is not restricted to one or two people in one or two States. We have examples over the last 3 or 4 years of misconduct by union leaders in 48, at least, of the 50

States. A couple of examples here might be relevant.

Looking at the neighboring State of Wisconsin, on September 21, 2006, in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, Felix A. Robinson, former president of the Industrial Division of the Communication Workers of America, Local 84101, pled guilty to one count of embezzling union funds. The guilty plea followed investigation by the OLMS Milwaukee district office.

Sad to say it happens in my own State. On February 22 of this year, 2007, in the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota, Catherine Bronson, former business representative for Hotel and Restaurant Employees Local 21 in Rochester, Minnesota, was sentenced to 180 days of home confinement.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCHANT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Could the gentleman tell me, have there been any more labor leaders indicted lately than Members of Congress?

Mr. MARCHANT. Reclaiming my time, Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. We have pages and pages of examples. Let me just give another one so that my colleagues and the workers of America understand that we are talking about misbehavior, illegal behavior on the part of people who have the responsibility for taking care of their union dues.

November 7, 2006, in the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota, Timothy J. Pulvermacher, former financial secretary for USWA Local 9444 pled guilty to embezzling union funds.

January 8, 2007, Kathryn Stark, former office manager for IBEW Local 31 was sentenced to a 6-month confinement.

Why? Because they are abusing their union members. They are stealing from them. And this is the only office that has the responsibility and authority for holding them accountable.

So we can debate for all day, I suppose, who is for the worker and who is not for the worker and whether the tax cuts are good for the worker. We certainly believe they are on this side of the aisle. But that is not what my amendment is about. My amendment is about making sure that the office who has the responsibility for holding union leaders accountable for their workers' funds has the staff it needs to do the job.

The base bill, cutting $2 million would force that office to cut staff members, the very people who conduct the investigations and bring these people to justice.

Again, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this amendment which supports the union workers of America and holds those who misbehave accountable. And I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment introduced by my friend Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, a dedicated U.S. Marine veteran, which restores much needed funding to the Office of Labor Management Standards (OLMS). I applaud Representative KLINE's continued efforts to draw attention and support to this very important issue, and I appreciate his dedicated leadership in this area.

This straightforward amendment would add $2 million to the current legislation and restore funding for OLMS to its fiscal year 2007 levels. This addition would also enable the agency to hire 13 full-time employees.

The Office of Labor Management Standards plays a vital role in administering and enforcing provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, LMRDA. This bipartisan law was enacted by Congress to ensure standards of democracy and fiscal responsibility in labor organizations representing employees in private industry.

When enacting the LMRDA, Congress expressed that union members and the general public would benefit by having access to information about labor unions. As a result, each union subject to LMRDA is required to submit annual financial reports to OLMS. This public accountability is achieved through the filing of LM–2 forms. Millions of working Americans have a portion of their paychecks given to labor organizations, and they deserve to know where their hard-earned money is going.

According to a September 2006 Wall Street Journal article, up to 60 percent of labor organizations' budgets are going to PAC contributions and lobbying activities. In one instance, only 36 percent of the funds actually went to representing union members in labor negotiations.

There is a high level of demand for this information. In fact, between May 2006 and May 2007, there were 767,908 hits on OLMS's website. That's an average of about 64,000 per month and over 2,100 per day.

Again, I am pleased to recognize the important work of the Office of Labor Management Standards, and I urge members to support this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE).

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

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam 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.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Of the unobligated funds collected pursuant to section 286(v) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, $70,000,000 is rescinded.

SPECIAL BENEFITS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the payment of compensation, benefits, and expenses (except administrative expenses) accruing during the current or any prior fiscal year authorized by chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code; continuation of benefits as provided for under the heading ''Civilian War Benefits'' in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947; the Employees' Compensation Commission Appropriation Act, 1944; sections 4(c) and 5(f) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. App. 2012); and 50 percent of the additional compensation and benefits required by section 10(h) of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, $203,000,000, together with such amounts as may be necessary to be charged to the subsequent year appropriation for the payment of compensation and other benefits for any period subsequent to August 15 of the current year: *Provided*, That amounts appropriated may be used under section 8104 of title 5, United States Code, by the Secretary of Labor to reimburse an employer, who is not the employer at the time of injury, for portions of the salary of a reemployed, disabled beneficiary: *Provided further*, That balances of reimbursements unobligated on September 30, 2007, shall remain available until expended for the payment of compensation, benefits, and expenses: *Provided further*, That in addition there shall be transferred to this appropriation from the Postal Service and from any other corporation or instrumentality required under section 8147(c) of title 5, United States Code, to pay an amount for its fair share of the cost of administration, such sums as the Secretary determines to be the cost of administration for employees of such fair share entities through September 30, 2008: *Provided further*, That of those funds transferred to this account from the fair share entities to pay the cost of administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, $52,280,000 shall be made available to the Secretary as follows:

(1) For enhancement and maintenance of automated data processing systems and telecommunications systems, $21,855,000.

(2) For automated workload processing operations, including document imaging, centralized mail intake and medical bill processing, $16,109,000.

(3) For periodic roll management and medical review, $14,316,000.

(4) The remaining funds shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts:

Provided further, That the Secretary may require that any person filing a notice of injury or a claim for benefits under chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, or the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, provide as part of such notice and claim, such identifying information (including Social Security account number) as such regulations may prescribe.

SPECIAL BENEFITS FOR DISABLED COAL MINERS

For carrying out title IV of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977, as amended by Public Law 107–275, $208,221,000, to remain available until expended.

For making after July 31 of the current fiscal year, benefit payments to individuals under title IV of such Act, for costs incurred in the current fiscal year, such amounts as may be necessary.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Chairman, during the full committee markup of this bill, an amendment was added that would prohibit the use of Federal funds for administering thimerosal-containing influenza vaccines to children under 3 years of age. While

I respect the good intentions of the author of this amendment and my colleagues who supported it, this provision creates significant public health concerns for the protection of our youngest children from both seasonal and pandemic influenza.

This past week, I have heard from numerous public health and scientific groups with expertise in immunizations. They all agree that there is no credible scientific or medical evidence that vaccination of young children with vaccines containing the preservative thimerosal causes autism or other neurodevelopmental disorders.

Madam Chairman, our national immunization policies must be based on science. I strongly believe that the United States Congress should not substitute its judgment about which vaccines are safe for our children for that of the major vaccine and public health experts.

Perhaps the most convincing statements against the amendment are in a communication from Dr. Julie Gerberding, the Director of the Centers For Disease Control and Prevention, dated July 16, 2007. Her opposition to the thimerosal amendment is as follows:

''There is no scientific basis to support a prohibition of use of thimerosal-containing vaccine. In particular, science does not support a causal association between thimerosal and autism. In fact, the Institute of Medicine concluded that, 'the evidence favors rejection of a causal relationship between thimerosal-containing vaccines and autism.'

□ 1800

''CDC respects this IOM conclusion.''

The Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices, a diverse group of expert advisers on vaccine use, has made its position explicitly clear. ''The benefits of influenza vaccination for all recommended groups including pregnant women and young children, outweigh the unproven risk from thimerosal exposure through vaccination.''

Instead, ACIP recommends that children and adults who need vaccination may receive any available vaccine preparation licensed for use in the person's age and risk factor group with or without thimerosal.

The supply of thimerosal-free vaccine is increasing, but we do not know precisely how many doses of vaccine licensed for use in children 6–35 months of age will be available in 2008–2009. Based on information from the manufacturers, the supply is not likely to be large enough to vaccinate all the children whose parents want this protection for them.

Even if the supply increases more than we expect, the realities of vaccine distribution make it impossible to precisely align supplies with vaccine demand in every practice or community.

Passage of the proposed amendment would mean that some children would not have access to influenza vaccine because the supply would be reduced. Tragically, some of these unvaccinated children would suffer the more severe consequences of influenza, even though vaccination would otherwise have helped protect them. For this reason, CDC strongly opposes the proposed amendment.

Madam Chairman, these are Dr. Gerberding's compelling arguments against this provision. I will not be offering an amendment today to strike it from the bill. However, considering the overwhelming outcry from the public health community against this amendment, I hope we will continue this discussion, and I look forward for a way to address these concerns in conference.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For making benefit payments under title IV for the first quarter of fiscal year 2009, $62,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, ENERGY EMPLOYEES OCCUPATIONAL ILLNESS COMPENSATION FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to administer the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Act, $104,745,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Labor is authorized to transfer to any executive agency with authority under the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Act, including within the Department of Labor, such sums as may be necessary in fiscal year 2008 to carry out those authorities: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may require that any person filing a claim for benefits under such Act provide as part of such claim, such identifying information (including Social Security account number) as may be prescribed. *Provided further*, That not later than 30 days after enactment of this Act, in addition to other sums transferred by the Secretary to the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) for the administration of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program (EEOICPA), the Secretary shall transfer $4,500,000 to NIOSH from the funds appropriated to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Fund (42 U.S.C. 7384e), for use by or in support of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health (the Board) to carry out its statutory responsibilities under EEOICPA (42 U.S.C. 7384n–q), including obtaining audits, technical assistance and other support from the Board's audit contractor with regard to radiation dose estimation and reconstruction efforts, site profiles, procedures, and review of Special Exposure Cohort petitions and evaluation reports.

BLACK LUNG DISABILITY TRUST FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

In fiscal year 2008 and thereafter, such sums as may be necessary from the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund, to remain available until expended, for payment of all benefits authorized by section 9501(d) (1), (2), (4), and (7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and interest on advances, as authorized by section 9501(c)(2) of such Act. In addition, the following amounts shall be available from the Fund for fiscal year 2008 for expenses of operation and administration of the Black Lung Benefits program, as authorized by section 9501(d)(5) of such Act: $32,761,000 for transfer to the Employment Standards Administration ''Salaries and Expenses''; $24,785,000 for transfer to Departmental Management, ''Salaries and Expenses''; $335,000 for transfer to Departmental Management, ''Office of Inspector General''; and $356,000 for payments into miscellaneous receipts for the expenses of the Department of the Treasury.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, $503,516,000, including not to exceed $91,093,000 which shall be the maximum amount available for grants to States under section 23(g) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act (''the Act''), which grants shall be no less than 50 percent of the costs of State occupational safety and health programs required to be incurred under plans approved by the Secretary of Labor under section 18 of the Act; and, in addition, notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration may retain up to $750,000 per fiscal year of training institute course tuition fees, otherwise authorized by law to be collected, and may utilize such sums for occupational safety and health training and education: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary is authorized, during the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, to collect and retain fees for services provided to Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratories, and may utilize such sums, in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of April 13, 1934 (29 U.S.C. 9a), to administer national and international laboratory recognition programs that ensure the safety of equipment and products used by workers in the workplace: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended to prescribe, issue, administer, or enforce any standard, rule, regulation, or order under the Act which is applicable to any person who is engaged in a farming operation which does not maintain a temporary labor camp and employs 10 or fewer employees: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended to administer or enforce any standard, rule, regulation, or order under the Act with respect to any employer of 10 or fewer employees who is included within a category having a Days Away, Restricted, or Transferred (DART) occupational injury and illness rate, at the most precise industrial classification code for which such data are published, less than the national average rate as such rates are most recently published by the Secretary, acting through the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in accordance with section 24 of the Act (29 U.S.C. 673), except—

(1) to provide, as authorized by the Act, consultation, technical assistance, educational and training services, and to conduct surveys and studies;

(2) to conduct an inspection or investigation in response to an employee complaint, to issue a citation for violations found during such inspection, and to assess a penalty for violations which are not corrected within a reasonable abatement period and for any willful violations found;

(3) to take any action authorized by the Act with respect to imminent dangers;

(4) to take any action authorized by the Act with respect to health hazards;

(5) to take any action authorized by the Act with respect to a report of an employment accident which is fatal to one or more employees or which results in hospitalization of two or more employees, and to take

any action pursuant to such investigation authorized by the Act; and

(6) to take any action authorized by the Act with respect to complaints of discrimination against employees for exercising rights under the Act:

Provided further, That the foregoing proviso shall not apply to any person who is engaged in a farming operation which does not maintain a temporary labor camp and employs 10 or fewer employees: *Provided further*, That $10,116,000 shall be available for Susan Harwood training grants, of which $3,200,000 shall be used for the Institutional Competency Building training grants which commenced in September 2000, for program activities for the period of October 1, 2007, to September 30, 2008, provided that a grantee has demonstrated satisfactory performance: *Provided further*, That such grants shall be awarded no less than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall provide a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate with timetables for the development and issuance of occupational safety and health standards on beryllium, silica, cranes and derricks, confined space entry in construction, and hazard communication global harmonization; such timetables shall include actual or estimated dates for: the publication of an advance notice of proposed rulemaking, the commencement and completion of a Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act review (if required), the completion of any peer review (if required), the submission of the draft proposed rule to the Office of Management and Budget for review under Executive Order 12866 (if required), the publication of a proposed rule, the conduct of public hearings, the submission of a draft final rule to the Office and Management and Budget for review under Executive Order 12866 (if required), and the issuance of a final rule; and such report shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate within 90 days of the enactment of this Act, with updates provided every 90 days thereafter that shall include an explanation of the reasons for any delays in meeting the projected timetables for action.

MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Mine Safety and Health Administration, $313,478,000 including purchase and bestowal of certificates and trophies in connection with mine rescue and first-aid work, and the hire of passenger motor vehicles, including up to $2,000,000 for mine rescue and recovery activities; in addition, not to exceed $750,000 may be collected by the National Mine Health and Safety Academy for room, board, tuition, and the sale of training materials, otherwise authorized by law to be collected, to be available for mine safety and health education and training activities, notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code; and, in addition, the Mine Safety and Health Administration may retain up to $1,000,000 from fees collected for the approval and certification of equipment, materials, and explosives for use in mines, and may utilize such sums for such activities; the Secretary of Labor is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private; the Mine Safety and Health Administration is authorized to promote health and safety education and training in the mining community through cooperative programs with States, industry, and safety associations; the Secretary is authorized to recognize the Joseph A. Holmes Safety Association as a principal safety association and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, may provide funds and, with or without reimbursement, personnel, including service of Mine Safety and Health Administration officials as officers in local chapters or in the national organization; and any funds available to the Department may be used, with the approval of the Secretary, to provide for the costs of mine rescue and survival operations in the event of a major disaster.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, including advances or reimbursements to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for services rendered, $497,854,000, together with not to exceed $78,264,000, which may be expended from the employment security administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, of which $5,000,000 may be used to fund the mass layoff statistics program under section 15 of the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 491–2): *Provided*, That the Current Employment Survey shall maintain the content of the survey issued prior to June 2005 with respect to the collection of data for the women worker series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PLATTS

Mr. PLATTS. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PLATTS:

Page 24, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $27,995,000)''.

Page 25, line 22, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,163,000)''.

Page 63, line 4, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,942,000)''.

Page 77, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

Page 77, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

Page 92, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $900,000)''.

Mr. PLATTS. Madam Chairman, before I address my amendment I certainly want to commend Chairman OBEY and the ranking member, Mr. WALSH, and their staffs for their dedicated work on this very important appropriations bill. I sincerely appreciate their efforts.

Madam Chairman, literacy skills are the cornerstone of our education system. I think that we can all agree that students who struggle with reading face challenges in all subject areas in school.

Unfortunately, children of parents who themselves have difficulty reading English are even more likely to perform at low literacy levels. For this reason, my predecessor, the Honorable Bill Goodling, former Republican chairman of the Education and Workforce Committee, established the Even Start Family Literacy Program.

Even Start is the only Federal education program that teaches literacy skills to both parents and their children. Through this program parents receive the necessary skills to become a teacher to their children and to improve their lives.

Even Start serves the most economically and educationally disadvantaged population in the country. According to a Department of Education report, 84 percent of Even Start's families are at or below the Federal poverty level. Nearly half of Even Start families have an annual household income of under $6,000, and 84 percent of Even Start adults do not have a high school diploma or GED.

Even Start is a program that provides disadvantaged families with an opportunity to provide a better life for their children. Parents enroll in Even Start to become better parents, to further their education, and to improve their children's chance of success in school.

At the Even Start centers in my hometown of York, Pennsylvania, I've witnessed firsthand the positive and significant impact that this program is having on parents and children alike.

The Even Start program has yielded successful results. A 2005 Texas A&M study has found that, on average, employment rates rise from 17 percent to 51 percent after program completion. In addition, wages increased by more than 25 percent.

Despite these positive results, and even with the Appropriations Committee's approximately $17 million proposed increase over the fiscal year 2007 funding level, the underlying bill's proposed funding level for the Even Start program is 60 percent less than the amount provided in 2002. Even Start centers struggled this past year to keep their doors open, and many had to close their doors permanently because of this drastic funding cut.

For these reasons, I've introduced this amendment to H.R. 3043. My amendment would increase the appropriations for the William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Program by $50 million, bringing its total appropriation to $149 million. While this increase may seem significant, it's important to put the proposed level of $149 million into perspective. Even with the increased proposed in this amendment, the total level of funding for Even Start will still be 40 percent less than the funding levels provided in fiscal years 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004 respectively. In fact, the underlying bill's funding level is less than what was provided even 13 fiscal years back, in 1995.

I certainly thank Chairman OBEY for his support and advocacy of the Even Start program throughout many years. The Even Start program helps our most disadvantaged parents better their lives for themselves and their children.

I hope all Members will join me in supporting the Even Start program. I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Madam Chairman, I yield back my time.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I don't really enjoy opposing this amendment because I think this is a good program

that the gentleman seeks to expand. But let me put his amendment in context.

The President of the United States tried to eliminate this program in his budget. The committee has provided $99 million for it, and for that the administration is criticizing us.

I would also point out that in the last year, when the other party controlled the House of Representatives, the committee cut Even Start by $29 million. We've done none of that. We've restored the funding, and I have a great deal of confidence in the program. But I cannot support the idea of adding the additional money the gentleman proposes because he takes it from a very damaging place.

Now, I know that there is no political constituency for the Bureau of Labor Statistics. No one is going to get excited if they hear that we are cutting back funding for that agency. But, in fact, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which produces the Consumer Price Index, puts together the numbers that determine the way hundreds of billions of dollars flow in this budget and flow in this economy.

We are operating on the basis of an ancient Consumer Price Index. The housing component of that index, which makes up almost 30 percent of it, is some 17 years out of date, and we know there's been a lot of change in housing stock over the last 17 years.

And it just seems to me that while the gentleman is citing a worthy program for adding funds, I would suggest that it would do tremendous long-term damage to this country in terms of equity if we do not update and modernize the data being produced by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Republicans can have their set of facts, Democrats can have their set of facts, but in the end we need to disregard both sets and we need to have statistics which underlie all of the economic decisions that we make. And it makes no sense to be proceeding on the basis of 17-year old statistics.

So, much as I regret having to oppose the gentleman's amendment and much as I regret having to call Bill Goodling, who is the original sponsor of the program, to tell Bill that I couldn't support the increase in this instance, I do think that the responsible thing to do in this instance is to vote ''no.''

I forgot to mention, and far be it for me to defend the administration's Cabinet appointees. But the gentleman, as I understand it, would take a significant amount of this funding from the Department of Labor administration accounts.

I would point out the administration is also complaining about the cuts we've made in the Labor Secretary's budget. Their Information and Technology Account has already been cut by 39 percent. The Office of the Secretary has already been cut by 17 percent. And we did not provide the requested funds for a core accounting system, and the administration specifically brings attention to their concerns about this. And I honestly do not think it's advisable to cut the agency even more deeply.

And let me assure the gentleman that I would actually prefer that he withdraw the amendment and I'd be happy to try to work, as I'm sure the gentleman from New York would, to try to improve the Even Start position in conference.

But if he has to rely on these kinds of offsets, I regret it, but I simply cannot see my way clear to support it.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS).

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

Mr. PLATTS. Madam 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 Pennsylvania will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF DISABILITY EMPLOYMENT POLICY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Office of Disability Employment Policy to provide leadership, develop policy and initiatives, and award grants furthering the objective of eliminating barriers to the training and employment of people with disabilities, $27,712,000.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for Departmental Management, including the hire of three sedans, and including the management or operation, through contracts, grants or other arrangements of Departmental activities conducted by or through the Bureau of International Labor Affairs, including bilateral and multilateral technical assistance and other international labor activities, $292,943,000, of which $72,516,000 is for the Bureau of International Labor Affairs (including $5,000,000 to implement model programs to address worker rights issues through technical assistance in countries with which the United States has trade preference programs), and of which $18,000,000 is for the acquisition of Departmental information technology, architecture, infrastructure, equipment, software and related needs, which will be allocated by the Department's Chief Information Officer in accordance with the Department's capital investment management process to assure a sound investment strategy; together with not to exceed $318,000, which may be expended from the employment security administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REICHERT

Mr. REICHERT. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REICHERT:

Page 25, line 22, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,500,000)''.

Page 33, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,500,000)''.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment. We don't have a copy of it.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REICHERT. Madam Chairman, as the former sheriff of King County in Seattle, Washington, and the cochairman of the Congressional Children's Health Care Caucus, I am proud to offer this amendment supporting emergency medical services for children.

I am pleased to be joined in offering this amendment by Congressman MATHESON, and to have the support of Congressman KING from New York, both of whom have been outstanding leaders on this issue.

Our amendment will provide $2.5 million in additional resources for emergency medical services for children's programs offset from the Department of Labor's General Administrative Account. This vital program provides grants to States and medical institutions, to expand and improve emergency care for children who need treatment for life-threatening illnesses or injuries.

This modest funding increase will help a program that has been nearly level funded for the past 6 years. It will better serve those who provide emergency care for our children.

Children, as everyone knows, are not small adults. The illnesses and injuries that bring them into emergency rooms vary significantly, and they often need equipment that is smaller than what is used for adults, and medication in much more carefully calculated doses.

□ 1815

Although children account for 30 million annual visits to the emergency rooms, many hospitals and emergency management agencies are not well equipped to handle these patients. According to the Centers for Disease Control, only 6 percent of the United States emergency departments have all the supplies they need to handle pediatric emergencies.

Emergency Medical Services grants have been awarded to all 50 States, the District of Columbia and five territories. They have been used to train first responders to buy pediatric equipment for hospitals and to establish and improve standards for emergency care for children. Other grants have been used to create pediatric treatment guides for school nurses to test best practices and to incorporate pediatric care into State disaster plans.

Madam Chairman, this is a simple amendment with a significant impact on emergency care for our children. I urge all my colleagues to join in supporting this important measure.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. OBEY. I withdraw the point of order and move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, let me simply point out that the administration has sent us a statement of administration policy, or SAP as it is known in the trade, and they indicate that the President intends to veto this bill. And one of the reasons they intend to veto the bill is because they say this bill spends too much money. I would simply point out that virtually every Republican amendment that has been offered so far is an amendment to increase funding for a specific program.

On this program the President zeroed out this very worthy program. The committee fully restored the funding at the previous year's level of $19.8 million, and now this amendment seeks to add a small amount in addition by taking it out of departmental management.

As the Chair of the committee, I think it is my obligation to the administration to try to be somewhat objective about the funding level that they need in order to fund their agency activities. But if we are going to continue to get amendments from the administration's own side of the aisle that further reduce Cabinet Secretaries' operating budgets, who am I to object? So if the administration can't save itself from its friends, far be it from me to intercede, and so I would simply say that on this I will accept the amendment.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I won't take the full 5 minutes. I would just like to say I am also prepared to accept the amendment. But I would make the note that this is not an increase in spending. There is an offset. We are moving money from one place to another. It does not increase overall spending. It is cost neutral.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MARCHANT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARCHANT:

Page 25, line 22, after each dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $58,419,000)''.

Mr. MARCHANT. Madam Chairman, my amendment would reduce funding in the bill for the International Labor Affairs Bureau to the President's requested level of $14 million. This would save $58.4 million in this category.

The underlying bill provides $72.5 million for this account. This amendment would reduce funding for the International Labor Affairs Bureau by $58.4 million to match the President's request.

The bureau was originally responsible for the Department of Labor's overseas research projects and international labor workers' rights, primarily research and advocacy. However, in recent years the bureau has taken on grant-making activities. The bureau's grant assistance is already provided for by the Department of State, and this amendment would restructure the bureau's activities to advocacy and research only.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, this amendment is very simple. It seeks to reinstate the President's 81-percent cut in the International Labor Organization appropriation in the bill.

Madam Chairman, I cannot walk into a union hall in my District, I cannot walk into a restaurant, I cannot walk into a barber shop without having someone say to me, OBEY, what are you guys going to do to protect workers from unfair competition? What are you going to do to protect us from slave labor in China? What are you going to do to protect us from countries that pretend that they are free market countries when, in fact, they are centrally directed Marxist countries? When are you going to protect us from goods being produced by child labor around the world?

The purpose of this International Labor Organization is to serve as the one agency that serves as a red flag when our workers' wages are being undercut unfairly.

So I think the issue is very simple, and I don't intend to take the full 5 minutes. If you really are comfortable with the idea of just letting the wonders of the world market determine what wages are for American workers, if you are really comfortable with the idea of letting substandard wages and substandard working conditions undercut legitimate American workers' interests, then by all means vote for the gentleman's amendment. If you think that the American worker deserves a square deal in the midst of this globalization rampage, then I would suggest you vote against the amendment. And, I do think that workers and the organizations who represent them will be watching.

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, I come to the floor tonight to rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. I come to the floor also to indicate my support for what we can do on this floor for labor here in America. And I think that is the optimum word, ''here'' in America.

This amendment will do just that. It will protect laborers in this country, and that should be the first priority of this U.S. Congress. We do that first and foremost by protecting the fruits of their labor. Their wages, their income, what they work for, 9 to 5 and longer, Monday through Friday or longer during the course of the week. We do that by ensuring that the money that we spend, their hard-earned tax dollars, is appropriately spent and appropriately prioritized. And I commend the gentleman for doing just that with this amendment.

There are many things that we would like to spend our dollars on. But when we are elected to public office, we are to come here and make sure that first and foremost the American citizen, and in this case, the American worker, is protected.

As I come to the floor tonight, as I have said in the past, we have now marked about 6 months into Democrat control of this U.S. Congress. And what has it wrought during those 6 months? The largest tax increase in U.S. history. The attempts to change historic rules of this House and in operations. And, finally, attempts to create slush funds in which dollars can be misspent on other inappropriate items, dollars that are earned from the backs and sweat of American labor. And that is why I come strongly to support this amendment by the gentleman from Texas, to make sure that their hard-earned dollars are not misspent.

How often have we gone back to our districts and heard the complaint of jobs in this country going overseas? Well, it is one thing to say the jobs are going overseas; it is another thing to ask the laborers in this country to support those jobs overseas. It is one thing to see our jobs flee from this country to go to foreign shores; it is another thing to ask the workers of this country, through their tax dollars, to in essence support the organizations' structure of those jobs overseas.

We are elected to public office to protect the workers of this country. This gentleman's proposal does just that, by making sure that their tax dollars are focused first and foremost on workers and their quality of life and their standards here in this country. We will protect American workers. We will protect American jobs. And with this amendment, we will protect the budget of the workers of America as well.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I am somewhat amused by the posture of the Appropriations Chair in the last two amendments, and I appreciate the difficult position he finds himself in. But on the one hand, the amendment before this one attempting to support the President's recommendation and then on this one lambasting the President's recommendation. So a case of whiplash, I understand, may be in order.

But it is important to talk about exactly what this amendment does. And I want to commend my good friend from Texas for proposing this amendment.

The Department of Labor proposes in the President's budget that $14 million go to the International Labor Affairs Bureau, which would move the agency closer to its core mission of research and policy analysis. Remember this is the Department of Labor, not the Department of State. In 2008 the International Labor Affairs Bureau will continue to focus on administering over $530 million, $530 million, in projects that were launched in previous years, including in the field of child labor, as the chairman mentioned.

The Department of Labor seeks to restore the International Labor Affairs Bureau to its original mission of research and advocacy by eliminating its grant-making activities. We have all sorts of duplication and redundancies in the Federal Government, and this certainly is one of them. As an example of that, between 1996 and 2001, the International Labor Affairs Bureau's funding rose by 1,500 percent over a 5-year period of time when the agency embarked on an expansive grant-making mission intended to combat international child labor, develop and disseminate AIDS prevention information in the international workplace, support core labor standards development, and provide bilateral technical assistance.

Madam Chairman, grant-making activities are appropriately funded through the Department of State and through the USAID, the U.S. Agency for International Development, and other agencies. For example, the 2008 budget includes $3 billion to continue international assistance activities in developing countries through the Millennium Challenge Account. The administration created the Millennium Challenge Account to provide targeted and accountable international development assistance to poor countries with a demonstrative commitment to ruling justly, investing in people, and encouraging economic growth. So there are more appropriate places to fund these kinds of grant activities.

I would suggest, Madam Chairman, that the gentleman from Texas has proposed an appropriate amendment to return the level of funding in this appropriations bill to a level that would allow the International Labor Affairs Bureau to return to its core mission, its core mission of research and policy analysis and I believe better serve this Congress and the American people.

□ 1830

So I commend the gentleman for his amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT).

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Madam 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 Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCAUL OF TEXAS

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCCAUL of Texas:

Page 25, line 22, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 84, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 84, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000''.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment in support of teacher training for deaf and blind children.

Madam Chair, the Department of Education has provided funding from within its special education national activities account aimed at children who are both deaf and blind, commonly referred to as "deafblindness." This money trains teachers who have such children in their classes on how to educate and include them in daily classroom activities. This modest $12 million program has not received an increase in nearly two decades.

Today over 110,000 people rely on this important program. Expanding this program will allow us to identify more children in need and increase the number of on-site technical assistance personnel.

This amendment simply increases the Special Education National Activities Account to provide the DeafBlindness program with a modest but necessary increase.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman would be willing to constrain his remarks, we would be willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. That's an offer I would be remiss to refuse, and I will accept the offer.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. I thank the chairman.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Page 25, line 22, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

Page 107, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Chairman, this amendment would increase the funding for the National Labor Relations Board by $500,000 and is offset by a decrease to the Department of Labor departmental management salaries and expenses. It is to allow the NLRB to start to reduce its cases. It's at 2 years now, and we're looking to reduce it. This is an amendment offered by MARK UDALL and myself and FRANK LOBIONDO.

The NLRB takes an extraordinary amount of time to review and render a decision on employment disputes.

According to the NLRB, the median mount of time it takes from the filing of a charge to the issuance of the NLRB'S decision is over 2 years.

The funding in the Shays-Udall-LoBiondo amendment will allow the NLRB to retain some of its full-time staff, which they otherwise would have to let go due to the pay increase for Government employees.

It will also be used to train supervisors and new employees to ensure they are handling the cases efficiently and effectively, without sacrificing quality.

Funding, however, is not the only answer to the NLRB's problems.

We need to create deadlines to ensure the NLRB renders decisions in an expedient manner.

MARK UDALL, FRANK LOBIONDO, and I have been working on legislation to require the NLRB to issue their decisions promptly.

The bill will require the NLRB to issue a decision not later than 9 months after the date on which the initial complaint was served.

Should the Board not reach a decision within 9 months, it must transmit a report to Congress provide the reason or reasons the deadline was not met and what steps it is taking to reach a decision.

One high-profile NLRB decision found the Smithfield Packing Company guilty of illegally assaulting, intimidating, and harassing its workers in Tar Heel, North Carolina, when they attempted to form a union in 1994 and 1997. However, the NLRB's decision that the employer used unfair labor practices did not come down until 2005.

Taking this amount of time is an absurdity.

Mr. OBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAYS. Absolutely.

Mr. OBEY. Again, same deal; if the gentleman will constrain his remarks, we would be happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. SHAYS. I would be happy to. Could I just recognize MARK UDALL?

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for his generous offer.

I rise in support of the amendment.

I'd like to thank Chairman OBEY and Ranking Member WALSH and the Appropriations Committee for their leadership on this vital legislation that will help to provide quality healthcare, enhance education opportunities, and increase worker safety.

This is a good bill, but I think this amendment would make it better.

The amendment will increase the funding for the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) by $500,000, and is offset by a decrease to the Department of Labor Departmental Management Salaries and expenses.

As we all know the NLRB plays a vital role in labor-management relations.

It hears appeals of unfair labor practices and resolves questions about the composition of bargaining units.

We need to maintain its ability to do its job.

But without the additional funding this amendment will provide, there is a danger that they will have to lay off some of their staff in order to pay for their required overhead, including salaries.

The amendment would prevent that, and would also enable the NLRB's staff to handle cases efficiently and effectively, without sacrificing quality.

Funding is not the only problem that faces the National Labor Relations Board but congress should make it easier not harder for the National Labor Relations Board to administer decisions.

I urge the House to adopt the Shays-Udall amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JINDAL

Mr. JINDAL. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JINDAL:

Page 25, line 22, after the first dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $50,000,000)''.

Page 38, line 18, after the aggregate dollar amount insert ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

Mr. JINDAL. Madam Chairman, the Labor-HHS Subcommittee has funded the Center for Disease Control's Division of Tuberculosis Elimination at $150 million in this bill. Over the past 15 years, funding for this program has been level. There has been no increase in funding for this program since 1993.

Madam Chairman, every State and most major cities have TB control programs. Approximately 75 percent of the funds appropriated for this program are used in the States.

Funding for this program is critically important because just last year, in 2006, more than 20 of the 50 States had increases in TB cases. My home State of Louisiana, as well as most other States, have a large number of workers who travel the globe to share their expertise. Unlike tourists who stay in hotels in environments where TB exposure does not normally occur, Louisiana's oil and gas workers spend months working and living in environments among the local population where exposure can and does occur. TB exposure in these communities can result in many fatalities.

Another key issue for States and cities is the huge number of foreign-born students attending universities in the United States. More than half of the TB cases in the United States stem from foreign-born students who come here on student visas and often return home for summers and holidays, risking exposure in their home country. While risk of exposure is high for these students, their return to universities in the United States with the possibility of a latent TB infection creates the same problem seen in oil and gas workers.

If the disease is activated, the number of people exposed is tremendous. The last such case at a Louisiana university exposed 120 contacts in classes as well as in the dorms.

At present, there is no mandatory screening of this group, and no vaccine to prevent disease. The Georgia man whose case recently made headlines was exposed while volunteering overseas. As in his case, volunteers or overseas workers can return to the United States with a latent TB infection and activate the spread of this disease in the United States, later exposing family, friends and coworkers. No routine screening is performed, and no effective vaccine is available to prevent the spread of this disease.

My amendment is supported by the American Lung Association, American Thoracic Society, National Coalition for the Elimination of Tuberculosis, and the National TB Controllers Association.

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I don't like to have to oppose this amendment, but the fact is where some of the previous amendments were merely troublesome, this amendment is irresponsible.

Now, let us point out what's happened so far. What we have going on here is a ''let's pretend'' game. We have the administration telling us that this bill is runaway spending, and they threaten to veto the bill when in fact this bill in real terms is only a little over a 2 percent increase over last year. It is a large difference with the President's budget, but that's because he tried to cut $7.5 billion of it. In real terms, this bill goes up by less than $5 billion.

By now we have a number of people in this House who are trying to escape from the consequences of the President's budget. So we have pretended in one amendment that we can add money to AmeriCorps by taking money out of administrative management accounts for the Labor Department.

Then we are pretending that we can take out, yes, just a small amount, $500,000, out of that same account in order to deal with National Labor Relations Board. Then we are having another effort to escape the squeeze on behalf of another very worthy cause, deaf and blind children. And those have been accepted.

But now this amendment comes in, and it proposes to increase funding for a very worthy cause, Center for Disease Control TB Elimination Program. That is funded in the bill at $150.7 million, an increase of $13.7 million over fiscal 2007 and $13.9 million over the President's request. The funding included in this bill is a 10 percent increase over fiscal 2007.

Now, everybody knows that we would like to be providing more money for that program and a dozen others in this bill. But we are trying, evidently, to give some credence to the administration's complaints about dollar levels in spending.

So what does this amendment do? It savages the ability of the Secretary of Labor to run any programs at all, because what it does is to require a 25 percent cut in the ability of the Secretary of Labor to manage all of the programs within their jurisdiction. So that means that you have to chop the living guts out of the Secretary's own office; you have to chop the guts out of the Solicitor's office. And that is the office that deals with enforcement for mine safety, for OSHA, or even the OLMS union violations that were the subject of a previous amendment just a couple minutes ago.

And what this all is is a giant ''let's pretend'' operation. It's a game that pretends that we are doing something real by adding money for these accounts, when you know that if you're going to be responsible, when we go to conference we're going to have to restore most of these management accounts or else we will have a government agency, admittedly one run by a very conservative Republican, but still a government agency which will be crippled in its ability to provide its functions.

I have in my office two signs. And whenever anybody comes to me asking for money, I make them read those signs out loud. This is what one of them says: ''What do you want us to do for someone besides yourself that's more important than whatever it is you want us to do for you?'' And I think that's the basic question we always ought to be asking in a Judeo-Christian society.

My problem with this amendment is, while it seeks funds for a very worthy cause, in the process it takes away crucial funds for many other worthy causes. And sooner or later, even in the Congress of the United States, we need to think about the needs of the whole. We need to think about all of the needs that the government has to deal with, not just one concern of one Member or one concern of another.

So in the interest of responsibility, I would urge a, very regretfully, defeat of the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I couldn't agree more with my colleague, the chairman of the subcommittee. It's difficult to oppose an amendment that increases funding for treating and dealing with tuberculosis. It's a very serious disease all across the Third World. And there is the potential for it coming into our society and creating real problems.

Having said that, there is an increase in the budget, it's $14 million above

what the President requested, a pretty substantial increase, a 10 percent increase in the budget. And while I respect the gentleman's desire to strengthen our country against the disease, it's not proper to take that amount of the budget of the Department of Labor for this purpose. That would hamstring the Department of Labor. It would not cut the fat, it would cut the muscle, it would cut the arms out. It would cut the eyes out of the Department of Labor, and I don't think anybody wants that.

So, I strongly urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. JINDAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH of New York. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. JINDAL. I won't take a lot of time. I just want to make one point.

I do thank the gentleman and the chairman for recognizing the good intent behind the amendment. I do want to point out that the offset still leaves in that account more money than what the President requested in his budget. The rationale for offsetting from that account is that, according to the administration there is a duplication of effort between the Bureau of International Labor Affairs, the State Department, USAID, and other agencies. So, even with the offset, we still leave more money in those accounts than the administration itself requested.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WALSH of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Reclaiming my time, there have been a number of amendments that have cut into this salaries and expenses administrative account. I suspect there will be more. We need to be very careful about further deep cuts.

And this is an especially large cut, $50 million. So I would, again, urge a ''no'' vote.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I will be relatively brief on this.

I want to commend my friend from Louisiana for offering the amendment. As a physician in my former life, I appreciate the remarkable increase in the incidence of tuberculosis and the need for surveillance as well as detection and treatment. So I commend my friend from Louisiana for offering this amendment. We all watched with some curiosity and some significant concern within the last couple of months as we tracked the travels of one individual from my City of Atlanta around the world who was felt to have a case of tuberculosis that needed to be treated urgently. So I commend my good friend for the amendment.

I do want to say in the larger context, however, that I'm a little perplexed, for the Chair of the Appropriations Committee talks about ''pretending'' to support AmeriCorps in previous amendments dealing with this section of the bill, ''pretending'' to support NLRB, ''pretending'' to support deaf and blind children, and yet those are the amendments that he accepted.

□ 1845

So I am a little perplexed as to why this amendment isn't being given the same, at least the same pretending of, support from the Chair of the committee.

I would also point out that the appropriately decreased reductions in the proposal from the administration in this area of the budget aren't taken in isolation. They are part of the entire, larger budget, which gets to the issue of the entire, larger budget that this new majority has passed, and that, as you well know, Madam Chairman, includes the largest tax increase in the history of our Nation. So I understand that somehow you have to pay for all these things, but I believe strongly that it is not the American people who desire to have the largest tax increase in the history of our Nation.

So I rise to commend my good friend from Louisiana for proposing this sound amendment. I would encourage its adoption. I understand the concerns that others have regarding the underlying section in this area of the bill, but I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JINDAL).

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

Mr. JINDAL. Madam 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 Louisiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Page 25, line 22, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $6,800,000)''.

Page 92, line 17, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,500,000)''.

Page 97, line 16, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $8,300,000)''.

Page 97, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $8,300,000)''.

Page 98, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,500,000)''.

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Chairman, this amendment transfers $6.8 million from the Department of Labor Departmental Management Salaries and Expenses and $1.5 million from the Department of Education Departmental Management Account to fund a $6.8 million increase in the AmeriCorps State and National program. The additional $1.5 million is needed to fund corresponding increases to the National Service trust fund for reimbursement of student loans.

This amendment will provide adequate funding to ensure that AmeriCorps State and National program will maintain the 34,000 full-time volunteer positions. Based upon the funding level in the legislation, the corporation will have to reduce its full-time enrollment by 600 positions and replace them with reduced, part-time positions.

There is a great deal of support for increasing Pell Grants in this Congress, something with which I agree. It seems to me, however, that with Pell Grants, the government and our society get no direct return, whereas with AmeriCorps, recipients of this aid are required to perform service to their community and Nation. There is a stipend for education, but they have earned it through serving their country.

To me, national service is one of the smartest investments our government can make. Not only is it a smart financial investment, but national service energizes our youth, empowers our volunteers and helps citizens make a very real, tangible impact on our communities.

Madam Chairman, I concur that we are taking from an account that the chairman has some concern about. I would hope that where it is going would outweigh that.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF JOB CORPS

To carry out subtitle C of title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2881 et seq.), including Federal administrative expenses, the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, the construction, alteration and repairs of buildings and other facilities, and the purchase of real property for training centers as authorized by the Workforce Investment Act; $1,649,476,000, as follows:

(1) $1,507,684,000 for Job Corps operations, of which $916,684,000 is available for the period July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009, and of which $591,000,000 is available for the period October 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009;

(2) $112,920,000 for construction, rehabilitation, and acquisition of Job Corps centers, of which $12,920,000 is available from July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2011; and $100,000,000 is available for the period October 1, 2008, through June 30, 2011; and

(3) $28,872,000 for necessary expenses of the Office of Job Corps, which shall be available for the period October 1, 2007, through September 30, 2008:

Provided, That the Office of Job Corps shall have contracting authority: *Provided further*, That no funds from any other appropriation shall be used to provide meal services at or for Job Corps centers: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this title for the Job Corps shall be used to pay the salary of an individual, either as direct costs or any proration as an indirect cost, at a rate in excess of Executive Level I: *Provided further*, That a total student training slot level of not less than 44,791 shall be achieved by the end of program year 2008.

VETERANS EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

Not to exceed $197,143,000 may be derived from the employment security administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund to carry out the provisions of sections 4100–4113, 4211–4215, and 4321–4327 of title 38, United States Code, and Public Law 103–353, and which shall be available for obligation by the States through December 31, 2008, of which $1,967,000 is for the National Veterans' Employment and Training Services Institute. To carry out the Homeless Veterans Reintegration Programs under section 5(a)(1) of the Homeless Veterans Comprehensive Assistance Act of 2001 (38 U.S.C. 2021) and the Veterans Workforce Investment Programs under section 168 of the Workforce Investment Act (29 U.S.C. 2913), $31,055,000, of which $7,435,000 shall be available for obligation for the period July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, $72,929,000, together with not to exceed $5,729,000, which may be expended from the employment security administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 101. Not to exceed 1 percent of any discretionary funds (pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.)) which are appropriated for the current fiscal year for the Department of Labor in this Act may be transferred between a program, project, or activity, but no such program, project, or activity shall be increased by more than 3 percent by any such transfer: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority granted by this section shall be available only to meet unanticipated needs and shall not be used to create any new program or to fund any project or activity for which no funds are provided in this Act: *Provided further*, That the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate are notified at least 15 days in advance of any transfer.

SEC. 102. In accordance with Executive Order No. 13126, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or expended for the procurement of goods mined, produced, manufactured, or harvested or services rendered, whole or in part, by forced or indentured child labor in industries and host countries already identified by the United States Department of Labor prior to enactment of this Act.

SEC. 103. After September 30, 2007, the Secretary of Labor shall issue a monthly transit subsidy of not less than the full amount (of not less than $110) that each of its employees of the National Capital Region is eligible to receive.

SEC. 104. None of the funds appropriated in this title for grants under section 171 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2916) may be obligated prior to the preparation and submission of a report by the Secretary of Labor to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing the planned uses of such funds.

SEC. 105. The Secretary of Labor shall award the following grants on a competitive basis: (1) Community-Based Job Training Grants awarded from amounts provided for such purpose under this title; and (2) grants during fiscal or program year 2008 under section 414(c) of the American Competitiveness and Workforce Improvement Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2916 note), as amended by section 428 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–447).

SEC. 106. None of the funds made available to the Department of Labor for grants under section 414(c) of the American Competitiveness and Workforce Improvement Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2916 note) may be used for any purpose other than training in the occupations and industries for which employers are using H–1B visas to hire foreign workers, and the related activities necessary to support such training: *Provided*, That the preceding limitation shall not apply to grants awarded under section 107 of this title and to multiyear grants awarded in response to competitive solicitations issued prior to April 15, 2007.

SEC. 107. Out of funds available to the Department of Labor under section 414(c) the American Competitiveness and Workforce Improvement Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2916 note), as amended by section 428 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–447), up to $20,000,000 is available (in addition to dislocated worker assistance national reserve funds) for the purposes of grants to States to address the gap in health care coverage faced by trade adjustment assistance (''TAA'') participants and dislocated workers awaiting TAA certification, to assure that these dislocated workers can benefit from the tax credit for health insurance costs authorized in section 35 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 108. The Secretary of Labor shall take no action to amend, through regulatory or administration action, the definition established in 20 CFR 667.220 for functions and activities under title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, or to modify, through regulatory or administrative action, the procedure for redesignation of local areas as specified in subtitle B of title I of the Act (including applying the standards specified in section 116(a)(3)(B) of such Act, but notwithstanding the time limits specified in section 116(a)(3)(B) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2831), until such time as legislation reauthorizing such Act is enacted.

SEC. 109. None of the funds made available in this or any other Act shall be available to finalize or implement any proposed regulation under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933, or the Trade Adjustment Assistance Reform Act of 2002 until such time as legislation reauthorizing the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 and the Trade Adjustment Assistance Reform Act of 2002 is enacted.

SEC. 110. (a) On or before November 30, 2007, the Secretary of Labor shall, pursuant to section 6 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 655), promulgate a final occupational safety and health standard concerning employer payment for personal protective equipment. The final standard shall provide no less protection to employees and shall have no further exceptions from the employer payment requirement than the proposed rule published in the Federal Register on March 31, 1999 (64 FR 15402).

(b) In the event that such standard is not promulgated by the date required, the proposed standard on employer payment for personal protective equipment published in the Federal Register on March 31, 1999 (64 FR 15402) shall become effective as if such standard had been promulgated as a final standard by the Secretary of Labor.

SEC. 111. None of the funds appropriated in this title may be used to carry out a public-private competition or direct conversion under OMB Circular A–76 or any successor administrative regulation, directive, or policy until 60 days after the Government Accountability Office provides a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on the use of competitive sourcing at the Department of Labor.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. SESSIONS: Strike section 111.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Chairman, my amendment would strike section 111 of this legislation, which, as drafted, would have the same effect as language already included in a number of the Democrat majority's other appropriations bills which prevents funds from being spent to conduct public-private competitions.

While this policy may be good for increasing dues payments to private sector union bosses, it is unquestionably bad for taxpayers and for Federal agencies because agencies are left with less money to spend on their core missions when Congress takes the opportunity to use competition away from them.

In 2006, Federal agencies ''competed'' only 1.7 percent of their commercial workforce, which makes up less than one-half of 1 percent of the entire civilian workforce. This very small use of competition for services is expected to generate savings of $1.3 billion over 10 years by closing performance gaps and improving efficiencies.

Competitions competed since 2003 are expected to produce almost $7 billion in savings for taxpayers over the next 10 years. This means that taxpayers will receive a return of about $31 for every $1 spent on competition, with annualized expected savings of more than $1 billion.

Specifically at the Department of Labor, since May 2004, 27 public-private partnerships have competed, involving over 1,000 positions. And thanks to a 10 percent protection clause, 24 of these competitions have been won by the government. This overwhelming track record of government success in competing with private sector begs the question, why would the Democrat leadership insist upon preventing Federal agencies from running their operations in the most efficient manner when they have been successful in the past?

I think the answer is clear, Madam Chairman, that when this appropriations bill cuts the budget for the Office of Labor Management Standards, which monitors union compliance with Federal law, and prevents competitive sourcing from taking place, that the Democrat leadership is clearly hearing from labor bosses that this bill represents a good opportunity to increase the power of labor bosses at the expense of taxpayers and good government.

In this time of stretched budgets and bloated spending, Congress should be looking to use all of the tools it can to find taxpayer savings and reduce the cost of services that are already being provided by thousands of hardworking companies nationwide.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense taxpayer-first amendment to oppose the underlying provision to benefit private sector union bosses by keeping cost-saving competition available to the government.

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, this bill contains a provision that freezes public-private competitions at the Department of Labor under OMB circular A–76. That process is used to compete out jobs now performed by Federal employees. Significant resources have been spent by the Department over the last several years on contracting out government jobs, and the committee believes it is time to take a step back and examine how the process is working.

Government-wide statistics cast doubt, frankly, on the overall effectiveness of this process. OMB reports in fiscal year 2006 that government employees won the competition in more than 85 percent of the cases where competitive sourcing was used. At DOL, the results have been similar. Since the process has begun, DOL employees have won 22 of the 25 competitions.

Now, aside from questions about the lack of compelling evidence of cost savings or increased efficiency, there is concern about the fact that the Department is not taking proper care to assure that functions that ought to be considered inherently governmental or are otherwise unsuitable for contracting performance are excluded from these competitions.

We have seen some competitions where regulatory and policy functions are included and believe that an independent look at the Department of Labor's use of this authority is warranted.

The gentleman says that it is labor bosses who are concerned about this. The last time I looked, this was having a disproportionate impact on women and on minority workers, and we are asking the GAO to assess the impact on them.

□ 1900

The bill language freezes the A–76 process at the Department of Labor until the committee has the benefit of a GAO review of that process. What is wrong with that?

The Comptroller General chaired a panel that submitted a report to Congress in 2002 and the request to GAO will be to ask for an assessment of the extent to which the sourcing principle adopted by the panel, including the recognition of inherently governmental functions, are being followed by the Department. This department is frankly not known to be a friend of the worker, certainly not under the present regime. It certainly is not known to be a friend to Federal workers, and it seems to me that we have seen in Iraq what happens when we contract out everything in sight. We have seen what happens in the Labor Department when 90 percent of one of their most important manpower programs, when 90 percent of the money in that program is farmed out on a noncompetitive basis. Frankly, we have sincere doubt about the balance with which the Department is approaching this issue.

Therefore, we asked the GAO to review the process. What on earth is wrong with that? I urge opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Chairman, the moratorium on A–76 public-private competition at the Department of Labor is the right provision, in the right bill at the right time.

The moratorium is included in this Appropriations bill because the Department of Labor has made indications that the agency is trying to reach numerical privatization targets—quotas—for its outsourcing.

The use of outsourcing quotas was first addressed by Congress when the Office of Management and Budget under the Bush Administration introduced its effort to outsource at least 15 percent of each agency to the private sector, with a goal of outsourcing up to half of the agency workforce.

The problem with outsourcing quotas is that they are a "one-size-fits-all" arbitrary privatization effort. Quotas never consider the unique needs of different Federal agencies, and they often lead to widespread cuts that harm the ability of Federal agencies to effectively carry out their mission.

I offered an amendment to the Transportation-Treasury Appropriations Act in 2003 that shed light onto the administration's effort, and outlawed the outsourcing quota.

Now it appears that the Department of Labor is taking the same approach.

In the next two years, over 2,000 jobs are expected to be competed, many of which appear to be both inherently governmental and even discriminatory.

These jobs include technical writers reviewing OSHA enforcement action, senior instructor for safety specialist responsibilities, and physical scientists that analyze toxic materials in working environments. It is vital that these positions provide sound, objective services that Federal employees can.

Furthermore, the majority of employees impacted by the recent round of A–76 competitions were older African-American women. The GAO report will analyze whether the scheduled outsourcings are discriminatory.

The DOL has won 21 out of 23 competitions conducted in the past 3 fiscal years. Millions of dollars have been spent over the last several years on these initiatives; 90 percent of the cases are won by Government.

The GAO report would give Congress an objective analysis of the outsourcing program at the Department of Labor from which to base further decisions.

Competitive sourcing is not inherently a bad thing if it can save money for the Federal Government, but arbitrary quotas, numerical targets, are a bad thing.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam 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 Texas will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor Appropriations Act, 2008".

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES

For carrying out titles II, III, IV, VII, VIII, X, XII, XVI, XIX, and XXVI of the Public Health Service Act, section 427(a) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act, title V and sections 1128E, 711, and 1820 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320a–7e, 912, and 1395i–4), the Health Care Quality Improvement Act of 1986, the Native Hawaiian Health Care Act of 1988, the Cardiac Arrest Survival Act of 2000, construction and renovation (including equipment) of health care and other facilities, and section 712(c) of the American Jobs Creation Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 300b–1 note), $7,055,709,000, of which $63,538,000 from general revenues, notwithstanding subsection (j) of section 1820 of the Social Security Act, shall be available for carrying out the Medicare rural hospital flexibility grants program under such section: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, $100,000 shall be available until expended for facilities renovations at the National Hansen's Disease Programs Center (as described in section 320 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247e)): *Provided further*, That in addition to fees authorized by section 427(b)(4) of the Health Care Quality Improvement Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11137(b)(4)), fees shall be collected for the full disclosure of information under the Act sufficient to recover the full costs of operating the National Practitioner Data Bank authorized under such Act, and shall remain available until expended to carry out such Act: *Provided further*, That fees authorized under subsection (d)(2) of section 1128E of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320a–7e) to be collected for the full disclosure of information under the national health care fraud and abuse data collection program established under such section, shall be sufficient to recover the full costs of operating the program, and shall remain available until expended to carry out that program: *Provided further*, That $35,000,000 of the funding provided for community health centers shall be used for base grant adjustments for existing centers: *Provided further*, That no more than $40,000 is available until expended for carrying out the provisions of section 224(o)(6) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 233(o)(6)) including associated administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That $3,963,000 is available until expended for the National Cord Blood Stem Cell Program: *Provided further*, That no more than $45,000,000 is available until expended for carrying out the amendments to section 224 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 233) made by the Federally Supported Health Centers Assistance Act of 1995 and for expenses incurred by the Department of Health and Human Services pertaining to administrative claims made pursuant to such amendments: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, $310,910,000 shall be for the program under

title X of the Public Health Service Act to provide for voluntary family planning projects: *Provided further*, That amounts provided to such projects under such title shall not be expended for abortions, that all pregnancy counseling shall be nondirective, and that such amounts shall not be expended for any activity (including the publication or distribution of literature) that in any way tends to promote public support or opposition to any legislative proposal or candidate for public office: *Provided further*, That of the funds available under this heading, $1,865,800,000 shall remain available to the Secretary of Health and Human Services through September 30, 2010, for parts A and B of title XXVI of the Public Health Service Act: *Provided further*, That within the amounts provided for part A of title XXVI of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300ff–11 et seq.), funds are included to ensure that the amount of any funding provided under such part to a metropolitan area for the program year beginning in 2007 is not reduced by an amount that is more than 8.4 percent, and the amount of any funding provided under subpart II of such part to a transitional area is not reduced by an amount that is more than 13.4 percent, relative to the amount of the total funding provided under such part to the metropolitan area or transitional area, respectively, for the program year beginning in fiscal year 2006: *Provided further*, That $830,593,000 shall be for State AIDS Drug Assistance Programs authorized under section 2616 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 300ff–26): *Provided further*, That in addition to amounts provided herein, $25,000,000 shall be available from amounts available under section 241 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 238j) to carry out parts A, B, C, and D of title XXVI of such Act to fund the special projects of national significance under section 2691 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300ff–101): *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding section 502(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 702(a)(1)), not to exceed $170,991,000 is available for carrying out special projects of regional and national significance pursuant to section 501(a)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 701(a)(2)).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEARNS:

Page 33, line 25, after the aggregate dollar figure insert ''(increased by $12,500,000)''.

Page 90, line 7, after the first dollar amount insert ''(increased by $12,500,000)''.

Page 97, line 16, after the aggregate dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $25,000,000)''.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Chairman, my amendment is very simple. My amendment transfers 10 percent or $25.5 million from AmeriCorp to the TRIO educational programs and the geriatric program. I have one of these programs in my congressional district, and I have a large university, two community colleges, so I thought it would be appropriate considering lots of time we talk about the loan process for the students, and particularly for low income, first generation college students, I thought it might be appropriate to take a very small portion of AmeriCorp and give it to these two programs.

I think we all know that AmeriCorp has done some good work. When we talk about volunteerism, we talk about people who go out and help people after natural disasters. We have a lot of that in Florida. We recently had a tornado in Lake County. A lot of the people in the district donated blood. They helped mentor schoolchildren. We teach English to new Americans, we teach illiterate adults how to read. We also have volunteers who go in and clean up rivers and forests.

AmeriCorp is a little bit different. It does have volunteers, but these volunteers, obviously, are paid. Remuneration in exchange for choosing to contribute one's time, energy and/or money clearly undermines the word ''volunteer.'' This is a different type of volunteerism. We have had a discussion whether it is necessary to pay volunteers. Paying people to volunteer sort of almost contradicts the spirit of the word, but we have sort of accepted that and the program has continued to flourish.

There has been some question that Members on both sides have sought to legislate whether AmeriCorp members could spend time with political activities, campaigns, faith-based initiatives or unions. That got us into some controversy and some rhetoric. If the Federal Government were not involved in what should be a personal preference in the first place, we wouldn't have to have these conversations discussing whether we should allow these AmeriCorp members be involved with political activities, campaigns, faith-based initiatives, or unions.

So I think when you look at the overall spectrum, I think the modest amount I am taking from AmeriCorp and putting into these two programs, I hope Members agree with me, it is worthwhile.

Take a little money, give to TRIO programs. They are aimed, as I mentioned, at low-income, first generation college students. Currently there are 2,700 TRIO programs serving nearly 900,000 low-income students across the United States. TRIO is critical to our Nation's commitment to advance educational opportunities at our colleges and universities and, as a result, obviously our Nation's economic future.

I have had the privilege of visiting several TRIO programs at schools in my district and had the privilege of hearing some of the wonderful success stories from these students. For that reason, I would like to give them a little more money.

Also across many districts like mine there are geriatric programs. So I am taking part of this money from AmeriCorp and putting it into geriatric programs, roughly $12 million. These programs are currently funded at the same level as the previous fiscal year. Included in these programs are educational centers which provide crucial physician, dental and mental health training programs for the care of our seniors. Current Federal funding will continue the support of about 50 geriatric education centers and the training of over 50,000 health care providers. This funding should be increased to provide more education and training for more health care professionals so we can meet our aging population's future health care demands. This is particularly true in Florida.

I ask my colleagues to consider putting part of the money from AmeriCorp into the geriatric educational centers. They have done a great job.

In my district we have three of these geriatric centers. At the University of Florida, where one center is located, it was established in 1987 to provide educational services for faculty and practitioners in the State of Florida. Their goal is to provide better care for older Americans.

I close, Madam Chairman, and urge support for my amendment so we can create better educational opportunities for underprivileged youth through the TRIO programs, and better ensure adequate and quality care for our seniors.

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, once again we demonstrate the strangeness of the administration's statement of policy on this bill.

This amendment would add $40 million to TRIO. We have already added $40 million above the amount that the President asked for for that program. It is a worthy program.

The President also eliminated the funding for the other account that the gentleman wants to increase in this amendment. The President zeroed out the geriatrics program. The committee restored $32 million. So in both of these accounts, we are significantly above the President's budget; and yet we get another amendment from the other side of the aisle seeking to raise a worthy program.

Now he seeks to pay for it by cutting, among other sources, AmeriCorp. I am a little confused by that because just a few minutes ago the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut had an amendment to try to add money for AmeriCorp. The House turned that down. Frankly, had I realized that the gentleman's amendment was going to be offered, in this instance I probably would have accepted the gentleman's amendment from Connecticut because I don't think it makes sense to reduce AmeriCorp, which has already been cut $9.2 million below last year, although I admit they do have carryover funds of $8 million.

I guess what I am saying is I don't intend to stand in the way of this amendment, but it once again illustrates that when the administration claims that this bill is profligate, it is in fact far off the mark. Virtually every single amendment being offered today is being offered for the purpose of increasing funding for what is described as a worthy program.

Now, yes, in order to pretend that we are all equally focused on the same things, they say that they have an offset. But it is clear that the offset is a

secondary motivation and the primary motivation is to raise funding for these programs, and I think it indicates that the committee has been far from profligate when it has set the funding levels that we have set in this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. I rise to oppose this amendment not because of where the money is spent but where it is taken from. That is what I want to address.

I had an amendment to try to restore funds for AmeriCorp programs to bring it back to the level of 34,000 AmeriCorp workers. We can call them volunteers; we can call them workers.

I was a Peace Corps volunteer. Peace Corps volunteers are given whatever the minimum wage is in the countries where we serve. We are given a stipend when we return, a modest stipend. We are called a ''volunteer'' but we don't work for nothing. We have to have shelter provided as a Peace Corps volunteer, and we have to be paid something to buy food.

AmeriCorp workers, ''volunteers,'' are given a minimum wage in order for them to buy food and to pay their minimum expenses like rent. They may have a 1-year assignment or a 2-year assignment. Most of these people are young kids out of high school who may never have even had a job before, and now they have a job as an AmeriCorp volunteer with this wonderful hope that they can use the 2 years, the stipend that they receive of about $4,600 a year, for college expenses, for educational expenses.

Why would we increase a Pell Grant and not require anything of our young people, but we have an opportunity with AmeriCorp to have someone provide a service to their community, learn a skill and put aside money for education? They can't spend the stipend for anything other than educational needs.

So I just really would encourage my colleague to reconsider doing this. It is destructive, I think, to the program. It is, I think, foolish to think that we would not want these young people gainfully employed in society.

And I make this point particularly to my Republican colleagues. We helped write this bill. The Clinton administration was going to have a one-size-fits-all, and they said we will have a competitive model. We will run these programs State by State by State. We will have them be local programs so you have not the one-size-fits-all. The States then decide what programs competing on the State and local level should be funded. And the program really works well.

I think, if anything, we should be adding more money to AmeriCorp, not less.

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

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I reluctantly rise to oppose my friend and colleague's amendment. I certainly support the intent to provide more money for TRIO, and I also championed additional funds for the geriatric programs in the 2007 continuing resolution. But I can't support this cut to AmeriCorp.

Like my colleague from Connecticut who just spoke, I was a Peace Corps volunteer. The point was made you are not a volunteer if you get paid. Well, nobody gets rich at these jobs. You have to have some money to live, to pay the rent, to buy your food, and to call home on occasion.

□ 1915

So you still can be a volunteer and receive a small portion of income to maintain your livelihood while you're providing this service, but this program gives young Americans the opportunity to express their idealism, to give something back and to learn and to round themselves out and to broaden their horizons.

In fact, since AmeriCorps was established back in 1993, it has demonstrated some pretty remarkable results. Eighty-one percent of former members have volunteered. Additionally, after leaving AmeriCorps service in other areas, 89 percent of former members became employed in the public sector, and Lord knows we need good people working in the public sector. Ninety percent of organizations said AmeriCorps members helped their involvement with other organizations in the community.

Young people are idealistic. They want to do something positive in their lives. This is one of the few programs that we have in the Federal Government that gives them that opportunity. So I would again reluctantly oppose the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I'm pleased to yield to my friend from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. I thank my distinguished colleague from Georgia.

Madam Chairman, I am just going to briefly respond to my two distinguished Peace Corps representatives. I know both of them have had ample experience understanding what the Peace Corps is all about.

When they came to Congress, we didn't have the AmeriCorps. In fact, the AmeriCorps is only a recent program here in Congress, and it's been funded continually every year.

I think this is a question not of the Peace Corps merits, but this is a question of priorities. And I think both of them would realize that the TRIO, which helps low-income students in college, is probably just as deserving, as well as geriatric education programs that are part of the amendment here which would get more funding. So it's only in terms of priority, and I think when you look at the two programs, I think they trump the AmeriCorps.

I just would conclude by giving you an example, perhaps highlight two outstanding participants in the TRIO programs that are from my congressional district.

A sophomore at Loften High School in Gainesville, Florida, Juliun Kinsey was one of only 30 students nationwide selected as a Young Entrepreneur of 2007 by the National Foundation for Teaching Entrepreneurship for his unique and high-quality business plan. As a result, he received an all-expense paid trip to an awards banquet in New York City and a cash award.

Another example is Brooke Bostic, a TRIO program participant and a sophomore at Buchholz High School, which is also in Gainesville. He was one of only six students from Florida whose paper on global issues was selected for entry in the United Nations Association Student Paper Competition in New York City this spring.

So both these students benefited from the TRIO program. I think it has ample accommodation for us to say it has a higher priority when we take just a small portion from the AmeriCorps to use for this TRIO program.

So with that, Madam Chairman, I yield back to my distinguished colleague and thank him for the opportunity.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank my friend for his comments, and I would just like to underscore one point that he made, and that is, that all appropriations bills are bills that relate to priorities.

And we oftentimes hear from our good friends on the other side that we're quibbling or pretending or all sorts of descriptions about what's going on here tonight, but Madam Chairman, what's going on here tonight is the work of our democracy and the work of representatives in Congress to best represent their constituents.

And to scoff at ordering priorities for spending at the Federal level, I don't believe it's an appropriate message to send to the American people. This is important work. This is hard-earned taxpayer money, and it behooves us to spend as much time as any Member in this House so desires to determine the best way in which that money ought to be spent.

So I commend my friend for standing up for the priorities that he believes are most appropriate in this bill.

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

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

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

Mr. STEARNS. Madam 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 Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:

Page 33, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $3,500,000)'' .

Page 38, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $3,500,000)''.

Page 39, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $3,500,000)''.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chairman, I congratulate the chairman and ranking member on a very well-crafted and bipartisan bill. I'd like to particularly thank the chairman for including a nearly $100 million increase to the Ryan White CARE Act.

My amendment would add a $3.5 million increase to Ryan White title IV funding.

Title IV's unique model of coordinated, family-centered care has proven successful at promoting better health. HIV-positive children treated by title IV have reduced hospitalizations, fewer symptoms, and fewer opportunistic infections, resulting in overall improved health and longer life. Babies are more likely to be born HIV-free if their HIV-positive mothers receive prenatal care through a title IV program.

Nearly 90 percent of the people cared for by title IV live below the poverty level, and 88 percent are African American or Latino.

As HIV infections in women and young people continue to rise, disproportionately impacting low-income women and youth of color, title IV programs have needed additional resources in recent years.

A $3.5 million increase to title IV will prevent cuts to HIV services for women, children, youth and families living with HIV. Even this modest increase can help bring more pregnant women and young people into care and keep them in care.

Madam Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee and the ranking member as well, and I want to acknowledge the advocacy and support of Congressman HANK JOHNSON from the State of Georgia as well.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JINDAL

Mr. JINDAL. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JINDAL:

Page 33, line 25, after the aggregate dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $37,200,000) (increased by $37,200,000)''.

Mr. JINDAL. Madam Chairman, the current bill provides $37.2 million for nurse education and retention at level funding from the last fiscal year.

Nursing is the Nation's largest health care profession, with an estimated 2.9 million active, licensed registered nurses. However, only 212,927 of these RNs received their licenses after 2000.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics projects there will be approximately 1 million new job openings for registered nurses by 2010.

In 1980, 26 percent of RNs were under the age of 30. Today, less than 9 percent of RNs are under the age of 30, with the average nurse being 46.8 years of age.

In 2004, the highest level of educational preparation for nurses was 17.5 with a diploma, 33.7 percent had an associate degree, 34 percent had a baccalaureate degree, and 13 percent with a master's or doctoral degree.

The number of full-time nursing faculty required to fill this nursing gap is approximately 40,000. Currently, however, there are less than 17,000 full-time nursing faculty in the system.

The average age of a nursing professor is 52, and the average age of an associate professor is 49. Retirement accounts for about 25 percent of the decline in nurse faculty.

In 2005, 81 percent of accredited nursing schools stated they needed additional faculty. Only 350 to 400 nursing students receive doctoral degrees each year. Given that 52 percent of nursing schools require doctorate degrees as a criterion for professorship, it is imperative to increase the number of student nurses receiving doctoral degrees.

Because of the faculty shortage of those both willing and skilled to teach, nursing schools turned away over 30,000 qualified applicants in 2005 and 16,000 in 2004 to entry-level BA nursing programs.

Madam Chairman, my amendment directs an additional $37.2 million for nurse education retention, which would double funding from fiscal year 2007 levels. This account targets the education, practice and retention in response to the growing nursing shortage.

And in anticipating a potential objection that the amendment doesn't specify this, it will be possible to fund this amount from other accounts while still providing increased funding for other accounts, for example, like Job Corps' construction and renovation or Job Corps administration. In other words, within the underlying bill, it is possible to fund this amount while still providing increases to other accounts. Other accounts have been increased. I simply would like to make sure that we provide additional funding to address the critical nursing shortage that we are facing in our country, to both improve access, improve quality and decrease the cost of our health care.

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

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, if I could, I'd like to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman who's offered the amendment.

I'd like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana what is the offset that he's proposed to pay for this additional expense.

Mr. JINDAL. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. JINDAL. The amendment actually increases and reduces funding, so it's more to indicate an intent. But as an example, what I offered as an example was it would be possible to fund this amendment from accounts, for example, from the increase in the Job Corps construction and renovation account, from the Job Corps administration account, from other accounts that have been increased, while still leaving increases in those accounts.

So, even though this amendment does not take money from those accounts, it could be funded in that way.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Just a further inquiry to the gentleman. In order to add funds at a certain point in the bill, you have to derive those funds from another point in the bill. Would you please, for the record, identify where these $37 million come from.

Mr. JINDAL. If the gentleman would yield, again the amendment increases and then reduces by $37.2 million. But, for example, the money could come from the Job Corps construction and renovation fund, which is currently funded at $12.9 million above the President's request, from the Job Corps administration fund, which is funded at $28 million above last year's.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Would the gentleman care to identify which of those two funds he will provide this offset from?

Mr. JINDAL. Absolutely. The amendment doesn't do this. But, for example, $7.9 million could be taken from the Job Corps construction and renovation fund. From the Job Corps administration fund, $14 million could be taken. From the community service employment fund, the remaining funds could be taken. In all three cases, it would actually leave more funding than was there in fiscal year 2007.

So, again, the amendment doesn't actually reduce those accounts by those three amounts, but the funding could be provided in that way, still leaving increased funding in those three accounts.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Reclaiming my time, Madam Chairman, my understanding is that these funds, the offset would have to be provided from within the HRSA account, and while the amendment may be in order, I don't believe the offset is correct procedure.

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1930

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, I rise to support the gentleman's amendment, leaving aside the underlying question of the funding issue of where the dollars come from. I appreciate the ranking member's point with regard to that.

I want to go to the point the gentleman raises as far as the necessity and the importance of making sure that we have appropriate dollars spent on nurse education and retention and to have a level of funding for 2007. I come from the great State of New Jersey, and within the Fifth Congressional District, which I represent, I represent several, over five good hospitals and also long-term health care facilities as well.

As I travel about the Fifth Congressional District, and I meet with the various hospitals and the administrators from such, and I also meet with the people from the long-term health facilities as well, when I travel down to Trenton, our State capital, to meet with our State hospital associations as well, one of the first issues that always comes up in our discussion is the issue of the availability and quality of nurses in the State of New Jersey, I should say the availability of quality nurses in the State of New Jersey. Every nurse that we have is a quality nurse. We just need more of them in the State.

To that end, on a positive note I should add, we have initiated for some facilities in our State where we are providing more nurse training than we ever had before. One of the things, I will just say from a parochial interest, is once we do have that training for the nurses, we are going to do everything we possibly can to make sure that they stay after being trained in the State of New Jersey, but we will, of course, if need be, maybe allow them to go out to some other States as well down South, where I believe they probably have a need as well.

But this is a bill from a national perspective. I know the gentleman can speak to this more eloquently than I. This is not simply an issue up in the Northeast, and this is not an issue down South as well. I am sure that I can speak to any Member of this body from any portion of this country, and they will tell me similar stories that I am recounting here right now, that we have a lack of quality, skilled nurses in this country.

Maybe there are other underlying reasons for this. One that comes to mind, of course, is the rate of compensation for nurses. When you talk to nurses, when you consider the number of hours they put in as far as the training they have to go through initially, and then the net length of the time they have to get the other skills necessary to become a nurse, and then the amount of pay that they get, it is certainly not commensurate to what they provide to this community and to this country. On top of that, of course, is the long hours that they must struggle with in their jobs, and the conditions that they have to work with and under in certain circumstances as well.

So I take my hat off to the nursing establishment, the nurses, the young people, men and women that decide to go into this career. If there is anything we can do as a national body to facilitate that and encourage and foster this, I will support it.

So I commend the gentleman for coming up with the idea to make an amendment to the Labor-HHS appropriation bill to double funding for nurse education and retention, as they said, from the $37.2 million that's currently in the bill.

I commend his work. If I can work with him on this initiative or other initiatives in the future to address the issue of nurse retention, I am more than happy to do so.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chair, this is another one of those ''let's pretend'' devices that I guess we are going to be afflicted with the next 2 days.

This amendment doesn't do nothing to nobody, and it doesn't do nothing for somebody. The fact is that it pretends to move $37 million out of this account, and then it puts $37 million back into this account and pretends that something has been accomplished.

There is no congressional direction that I know of that's being accomplished by this amendment. There is no consensus about what it does. It makes no changes in either the bill or the report. As a practical matter, it doesn't do anything except let somebody pretend that they have just done something for nurses' education.

If it makes you feel good to play a ''let's pretend'' game, go ahead and vote for it. But let's not kid ourselves. This amendment is not a real amendment. It has no real impact. It pretends to have an increase. It has, in fact, no offset. It's simply a shell game.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JINDAL).

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

Mr. JINDAL. 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 Louisiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Page 35, line 6, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $11,037,000)''.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Chair, 2 years ago the President signed the Stem Cell Research and Therapeutic Act into law.

This bipartisan legislation is designed to turn medical waste to medical miracles by deriving stem cells from umbilical cords and placentas after the birth of a child.

Cord blood transplantation is saving lives and is doing so today. It is one of the most promising and exciting fields in the area of regenerative medicine. The bipartisan legislation, Madam Chair, establishes a nationwide integrated bone marrow core blood stem cell transplantation program.

The good news, according to a July 13 technical assistance briefing memo by HRSA, is that six major grant recipients, Duke, New York Blood, Puget Sound Blood Center, Stem Cyte, the University of Colorado and the Anderson Cancer Center at the University of Texas have received funds for state-of-the-art programs that are now part of the newly created National Cord Blood Inventory.

With significant infrastructure now in place, and more blood grant centers imminent, and single point of access to facilitate the delivery of those units, more than 4,600 units of lifesaving cord blood has already been collected.

HRSA reports that approximately $22 million from fiscal years 2004 and 2007 appropriations will make collection of some 17,000 cord blood units possible by the end of fiscal year 2007.

"The question is—then what?

According to HRSA—in FY08—the new Cord Blood Program, just coming into it's own, will have to rely entirely on new appropriations.

So the bad news, it seems to me, is that if funded at about $4 million for FY08, the amount in the bill, the current grant recipients will have to dramatically scale back in their cord blood banking initiatives just as they're ramping up; just as breakout is occurring.

At $4 million, only about 3,000 units will be available in FY08 for medical realization of the goal of 150,000 units the experts tell us is needed to provide genetic matches for over 90 percent of Americans who can be aided by cord blood transplant.

We've come so far—the network is in place. And that money buys more cord blood which means more people cured and more research to save even more lives.

The $15 million that my colleague from Alabama and I are asking Members to support comports with the authorized level and is derived from within the HRSA allocation, which in the underlying bill is being increased by $69 million over last year and $1.3 billion over the President's request. Our shift represents less than ¼ of 1 percent of HRSA's $7 billion.

Surely, we can accommodate an $11 million shift—the net effect of the amendment—to a proven regenerative medical treatment that will mitigate—even cure—a myriad of diseases including leukemia and sickle cell anemia.

Mr. OBEY. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. OBEY. Same deal as we have offered several times earlier today. If the gentleman is willing to shorten his remarks, we are willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I certainly appreciate that very generous offer.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I will be very brief.

Cord blood has proven to be very effective for many lifesaving purposes. We need to support this research.

I would urge a ''yes'' vote on the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman offered by New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARTON OF TEXAS

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARTON of Texas:

Page 36, beginning at line 5, strike ''*Provided further*, That within'' and all that follows through the end of the proviso.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I am willing to not speak at all if Mr. OBEY is willing to take my amendment without me talking about it.

I was chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee in the last Congress, and one of the things that I am most proud of was that in the late stages of that Congress we passed the Ryan White CARE Reauthorization Act of 2006. It's a 3-year reauthorization act. It was a bipartisan, bicameral compromise.

Some of the House Members that worked on it included Congresswoman MARY BONO on the Republican side, Congresswoman ANNA ESHOO on the Democrat side, Senator ENZI, Senator KENNEDY, Senator BOXER, Senator FEINSTEIN, Congressman DINGELL, of course myself, and many, many others.

One of the cornerstones of that reauthorization was a formula change in the dispensation of HIV/AIDS funding to more reflect where the epidemic is actually still in play in this country. Under the old formula you had one-half of funds based on a formula based on population, things like this, and then you had one-half of the funds based on a discretionary fund.

Under the reauthorization we changed that to two-thirds formula and one-third discretionary. But because we were changing the formula, we did put in a hold-harmless provision for the formula funding.

What we were trying to do was make more funds available to those areas of the country where the epidemic was still prevalent and growing, and less funds on a discretionary basis where the epidemic had once been centered but was now thankfully not as prevalent. The pending bill before us changes that formula.

Now, normally, that would be considered legislation on an appropriations act, and a point of order would have been reserved by Chairman DINGELL of the committee, and all we would have to do is make a point of order, and it would be sustained. Chairman DINGELL did not reserve that point of order, so I have to rise to try to strike it.

My amendment does not change the amount of funding for HIV/AIDS. It does prevent this reversion of the formula so that we would keep the bipartisan, bicameral agreement, that we would have two-thirds of funds based on a traditional formula and one-third of the funding based on discretionary.

Now, the effect of the pending legislation that I am attempting to strike, if we don't strike it, two cities will benefit, Newark, New Jersey, and San Francisco, California. Every other city that currently receives AIDS funding and HIV funding will be disproportionately disadvantaged.

So I hope that the House will accept my amendment, and we will keep the formula that was agreed to after intense negotiations where we have a two-thirds and one-third split based on formula and discretionary, and a hold-harmless on the formula side but not a hold-harmless on the discretionary side.

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I wanted to ask the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) a question if it's appropriate.

I wanted to ask the gentleman a question specifically about his amendment and the hold-harmless clause and its impact possibly on Ryan White.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. In the reauthorization bill that was carefully negotiated on both sides of the aisle and the Senate, we maintained a hold-harmless provision for the formula funding under the bill, but we did not put that hold-harmless provision to the discretionary funding in the bill.

Discretionary funds are based on actual active case counts, how many HIV/AIDS patients you have. There is a methodology to determine how many of those individuals there are, and then the discretionary funds are distributed based on need.

In the legislation that's pending in the appropriations bill, the hold-harmless provision, which in the authorization bill we had on the formula side, is also applied to the discretionary side. The effect of that would be that an area that at one time had a large number of HIV/AIDS patients, but those patients had either passed away or been cured or moved out of the area, they wouldn't get to use the old patient count for their discretionary request. They could only count for discretionary purposes the number of active cases that they currently had in their area.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Reclaiming my time, what the chairman, I believe, and the committee sought to do by adding this language was to create a stop loss that does not prevent cuts, but rather reduces losses to a level that the jurisdiction can absorb in one fiscal year.

For example, the San Francisco EMA, which includes San Mateo and Marin Counties, for example, will still receive about a $2.3 million cut. The language caps losses for eligible metropolitan areas like San Francisco at 8.4 percent, misrepresents the 5 percent hold-harmless loss that was agreed to in last year's reauthorization, plus the average loss for all title I jurisdiction, which was 3.4 percent.

□ 1945

But I think it is important to note, and then I would be happy to yield if the gentleman would like to respond, here are some of the other jurisdictions that will benefit from the stop loss language which included in the chairman's mark: Hartford, Connecticut, 892,000; New Haven, Connecticut, 712,000; Nassau-Suffolk, New York, 432,000; Puerto Rico, 310,000; Caguas, 286,000; Sacramento, 195,000. And it goes on and on and on.

So what we are trying to understand here is how the chairman's language, which seeks to remedy a particular problem, is fundamentally changed by the gentleman's amendment.

I would be happy to yield for his response.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Under the old law, the funding was based one-half on a formula and one-half on discretionary, and the discretionary counted active cases and also cumulatively, I believe, cases of individuals who had expired because of the infection. Under the new formula that we passed in the reauthorization bill, we changed the formula to two-thirds instead of one-half, and we reduced the discretionary from one-half to one-third.

We did put a hold harmless provision in on the formula side, but we did not apply that hold harmless to the discretionary side. So we also had a specific hold harmless for the first year of the

new authorization which we are currently in.

The effect of the language that is in the pending bill basically puts hold harmless not only on the formula funding, which we increase from one-half to two-thirds, but it also puts it on the discretionary side, the effect of which would be areas which don't have as large a patient count as they once did would get more discretionary funding; conversely, those areas that 5 or 6 years ago, perhaps, didn't have much of an HIV/AIDS epidemic would be shortchanged.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Reclaiming my time, I know my time is just about expired; I know the chairman may have some concluding remarks, but this has been very difficult from the beginning, and the chairman's language in the mark seeks to remedy ongoing problems, and I would encourage my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chairman, over 20,000 people have died from AIDS in the San Francisco-Bay Area, and AIDS continues to be the second leading cause of premature death in our area. In addition, and it is because of improved treatments, because of programs like the Ryan White AIDS program, nearly 23,000 individuals are currently living with HIV/AIDS, more than at any point in the history of the epidemic. Therefore, it is not the right time for the people in the San Francisco-Bay Area to have any cuts in their AIDS/HIV programs, because it is starting to work but it isn't working well enough, including my own county of Marin County north of San Francisco and the county of San Mateo south of San Francisco. Our communities have the third largest cumulative number of AIDS cases in the entire country.

This amendment will recklessly and irresponsibly put the lives of many of our constituents at risk. The very idea truly astounds me, the very idea that these lifesaving programs would be cut, that there would even be an offer to cut them while we are spending $10 billion a month to occupy Iraq just is beyond my comprehension. I have to wonder, what are some people thinking about? What are their priorities? I can tell you my priorities are with the health and the well-being of our constituents.

Treatments and support programs and systems for HIV/AIDS have come a long way. Now is not the time to pull the rug out from under the programs that are working and to stop supporting those who are living with AIDS and HIV, particularly in the most affected areas such as San Francisco and Newark, New Jersey. Therefore, I urge my colleagues, please oppose this misguided amendment.

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

Ms. LEE. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Barton amendment. This issue of HIV and AIDS, first of all, is a matter of life and death, and I don't want to see us tamper around with the language which we have in this bill.

Despite the inclusion of language in the Ryan White Reauthorization Act to protect against these drastic cuts that would destabilize existing systems of HIV and AIDS, one jurisdiction's award was cut by 31 percent, or $8.6 million. Several other jurisdictions also received larger than anticipated cuts. So the language that we have creates just really a stop loss effort that doesn't prevent further cuts but just reduces losses to a level that a jurisdiction can absorb in one fiscal year, which still to me is just not acceptable, but it is the best we can do in this bill. For instance, as we said earlier, the San Francisco EMA will still receive a $2.3 million cut.

The language also caps losses for eligible metropolitan areas like San Francisco at 8.4 percent, which represents the 5 percent hold harmless loss that was agreed to in last year's reauthorization plus the average loss for all title I jurisdictions, which was 3.4 percent. Also, the losses for transitional grant areas which were not protected by the hold harmless in the reauthorization will be capped at 13.4 percent.

We heard earlier some of the jurisdictions that were included in the chairman's mark, but in addition there is Jersey City, New Jersey; Dutchess County, New York; and others.

My colleague from California just mentioned over 20,000 people have died from AIDS in the San Francisco EMA, and AIDS continues to be the second leading cause of premature death in the city and county of San Francisco. Also, nearly 23,000 people are currently living with HIV and AIDS, more than at any point in the history of the epidemic. San Francisco also has the third largest cumulative number of AIDS cases in the country. In fiscal 2006, San Francisco's EMA received about $27 million. In fiscal year 2007, it is only $18 million. This represents again, what I said earlier, a 31.4 percent reduction.

Provisions were included in last year's reauthorization to prevent drastic cuts of this sort, and we don't believe HRSA properly interpreted these provisions.

I hope that we oppose the Barton amendment. We do not need any more destabilizing initiatives that would affect people's lives. This is a matter of life and death. We need to look at how we can begin to move forward to make sure that all of those that need the HIV/AIDS services receive those services in terms of care, treatment, and prevention, and start looking at how to do that rather than do the things that the Barton amendment does. So I urge us to oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. BILBRAY. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BILBRAY. Madam Chairman, I had the privilege to serve 10 years as a county supervisor in the County of San Diego serving a community that desperately needed help with the HIV/AIDS epidemic, and I also happened to have been privileged enough to serve on Interstate and Commerce on the Health Committee that reauthorized the Ryan White Act.

The biggest issue here that is being discussed by the Member from Texas (Mr. BARTON) is the fact that the need should follow the patient. I am sure the gentleman from Chicago recognizes that all of these agencies and all of this money is supposed to be to service the people, not to groups, not to cities. It is human beings we are talking about in need. His motion is a compromise. It doesn't say don't strike the need on everything, but it says let's take half of it or take a portion and give priority to those who need it.

Madam Chairman, this would be like somebody thinking that it would be appropriate to send as much money to an empty hospital that used to serve patients as it is to send it to the new hospital that is full of patients. All he is saying is, let's take a portion of this and commit it totally to need. Not all of it, but a portion of it. How can we go back to our districts and say the agency in a certain city was more important than the patients and the people who are sick who just happen not to be sick in that same area?

The fact is having a formula that puts weight to those who used to be served is an inappropriate formula, and we all agreed in the 1990s that we were going to phase that out. The gentleman's motion only moves forward that agreement we have always had when we talked about Ryan White, that Ryan White was a young man, not an agency. Ryan White was a human being who had AIDS.

This grant, this program was never meant to serve groups, cities, or agencies except if they were the victims of this hideous disease called AIDS/HIV.

And so I think, let's stop a second. These groups and people that want us to send them money because they used to serve a large number of patients and realize that they may have to move or they might have to change their employment, that is not what this fund is for. It is for serving patients. And so all the gentleman is saying is, please, let's follow the need, and let's not say that it is for treating those who are sick if we are going to send it to agencies that are not serving. Let's send it to those agencies that are serving. At

least let's start moving towards the total amount of this fund. And the honor of Ryan White is to make these funds totally committed to serving patients that are ill today, the patients that need the service today, not patients of the past. We can't solve the problems of the past, but we can solve the problems that face us today, this year, and in the future, and that is by making sure funds are committed to those who are actually sick today.

And I would support all of the funds going to only those based on a formula of today's service, because we are talking about this year that these funds are supposed to be sent. The gentleman has accepted a compromise; I am willing to accept that compromise. We should be able to go this far, and common decency says the gentleman should get a chance to be able to have this compromise worked out.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I want to point out in the brief time that the gentleman from California still has, the Barton amendment doesn't lessen funding for this; it doesn't change the total amount of dollars at all. It simply protects the agreed-upon compromise that the stakeholders, the House, and the Senate on both sides of the aisle agreed to in the last Congress. And what the compromise was is, we moved more to a formula funding mechanism, two-thirds, and one-third for discretionary. And on the discretionary side, that is totally based on active HIV/AIDS case counts. It does not include people who have passed away from AIDS.

And the gentlelady that spoke earlier about the number of people in San Francisco that have contracted the disease and have passed away is totally right that those people, unfortunately, are no longer here. They should not be counted for the discretionary funding because you can't help them now.

□ 2000

We want the funding from the discretionary side to go to those that actually still have the infection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I would like to respond to the gentleman from California, but I think it's appropriate to recognize the gentlelady from California because I have struck the last word already. And if she will give me 15 seconds, I would be more than grateful.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ESHOO. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Madam Chairman, we agree that this is about people and not about cities, and that's why the committee has an overall increase in the Ryan White funding.

San Francisco has more people living, not dying of AIDS, but living AIDS, than any other point in the history of the epidemic. The need is not going down in any of the 11 jurisdictions protected by this language and, therefore, the committee is correct in opposing the Barton amendment.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to Mr. BARTON's amendment. I believe that it will perpetuate a system of winners and losers in the allocation of Federal resources for AIDS.

When Congress reauthorized the Ryan White AIDS program last year, we included language to allow the historic epicenters of the disease to continue providing care to those in need. The language was specifically intended to protect against drastic cuts that would destabilize the existing infrastructure for HIV/AIDS care.

Now, my friend from Texas has been absolutely consistent, and so have I. He's always been opposed to what I've just described, and I have supported it. So it's gone back and forth. But we've both been consistent in terms of our positions. I obviously respectfully disagree with his amendment, because I think it's important to understand, number one, A, that you have to protect the infrastructure. This isn't simply, when we say the care of people, you have to have infrastructure for it. And I think, underlying the gentleman's amendment is the notion that dead people are being funded, and that simply is not the case. We are both on the Energy and Commerce Committee. We've debated it there, and that's why I'm bringing some of the flavor of what we've debated there.

Over 20,000 people have died from AIDS in San Francisco's EMA. That's the eligible metropolitan area.

Now, the gentleman from California that spoke just a few moments ago talked about his time on the Board of Supervisors. That's where I came from in San Mateo County. And San Mateo and the City and County of San Francisco have been partners in this. And it's what has really held up and helped to build the infrastructure to take very good care of people. We take it seriously. Every dollar in this, every dollar in this has an effect on human beings. So this is not some tidy formula that somehow is not going to affect the infrastructure. So that's another reason why I oppose this.

San Francisco's award for fiscal 2007 was cut by 31.4 percent, or $8.6 million. Now, in Federal money, $8.6 million, unfortunately, is not considered serious money. This is devastating in this EMA. I know of what I speak. I've been there on the ground. I see where the dollars go and what people get.

Now, several other jurisdictions also have received larger than anticipated cuts. So I don't believe that the HRSA properly interpreted these provisions and that this bill, very importantly, corrects that error.

The stop loss language does not prevent cuts. Instead, it reduces losses to levels that can be reasonably absorbed in one fiscal year. And that's really a very important operational phrase, ''reasonably absorbed in one fiscal year.''

Any Member of Congress want to take a 31.4 cut in what their income is to help them take care of what they have to take care of their responsibilities and obligations? It's absurd. It's absurd. So that's why we are rising in opposition to the amendment.

So the language caps losses for the EMAs at 8.4 percent. And I think that this represents the 5 percent hold-harmless loss that was agreed to in last year's reauthorization.

I think the Barton amendment would prevent us from responding to the real needs of people that suffer from HIV and AIDS, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chairman, I rise tonight in support of the Barton amendment. I hadn't intended to speak about this, but I was listening over in my office, and I am extremely concerned about the structure of this provision that has been added to the bill.

By increasing the percentage of the ''hold-harmless aspect'' the concern has to be about where are those dollars going to come from to pay for those increases?

My understanding is that other communities where authorized identified need may now be placed at risk. And yes, that would include my home district in north Texas. That would include the City of Fort Worth, Texas, where there are great numbers of people who, where unfortunately, the rate of acquisition of AIDS is increasing.

Madam Chairman, this was a carefully negotiated compromise on our committee, appropriately so. It was an authorizing committee. At best, this activity tonight is authorizing on an appropriations bill. At worst, it is a thinly disguised earmark for the Speaker of the House. I urge my colleagues to vote for the Barton amendment.

I yield to the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I don't want to belabor this, but I do want people to understand what the compromise was. Those that represent, as has been characterized, the epicenter of the original contagion on AIDS/HIV, are protected in the compromise.

Two-thirds of the funding is based on a formula that advantages those areas where the epidemic started. And we hold that formula harmless. You can't have, on the formula funding, more than a 5 percent cut the first year. That's this year. Then next year you get 100 percent of what you got this year, and the third year you get 100 percent of what you got the second

year. So there's no drastic, there are some reductions because on the discretionary side the population centers are changing. And on the discretionary side, the compromise was not to have a hold-harmless, but to base those on actual active HIV/AIDS counts.

Now, if you accept the base bill and reject the Barton amendment, you're going to have two areas, primarily, I'm told San Francisco and Newark, that get more funding, and every other area in the country gets less.

And since all the AIDS groups supported the bipartisan compromise, and both Chambers did, I don't think it's fair to change that by putting something in a base text that there were no hearings on, there were no amendments on, it wasn't debated in the subcommittee or the full committee, the appropriations, it was just put in, and our only opportunity is to try to amend that bill right now.

And again, if a point of order had been raised against it, all we'd have to do is make the point of order, but it wasn't reserved. So I think what the compromise was in the last Congress is eminently fair, and was carefully crafted and, as Mr. BURGESS has pointed out, worked out with everybody having input, and that the Barton amendment, which just reverts it back to that base compromise should be supported.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BURGESS. I'll be happy to yield to my friend from California.

Mr. BILBRAY. Madam Chairman, many people in this country would think the compromise being proposed doesn't go far enough. I think most people would say that the money for AIDS should follow the patient, not a bureaucracy. But it's equal protection.

Does somebody with AIDS in Fort Worth have any more or less of a right to Federal funds to take care of AIDS than somebody who lives in San Francisco? How about equal protection here?

Does an AIDS patient in Fort Worth have equal rights with an AIDS patient in San Francisco? That's the question here.

The compromise gives 75 percent preference to San Francisco. How much more preference do you want? And let's not talk about equal protection any more if you want to do this.

He has bent over backwards to try to cooperate and meet the people from San Francisco halfway at phasing this out. All we're asking for is stick to the compromise rather than continue to go. And I don't think that anybody that believes in equal protection can honestly say that an AIDS patient who happens to be in Fort Worth doesn't have the same rights and shouldn't be given the same protection and just as much money per capita as somebody in San Francisco.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HEALTH EDUCATION ASSISTANCE LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Such sums as may be necessary to carry out subpart 1 of part A of title VII of the Public Health Service Act. For administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program under such subpart, including section 709 of such Act, $2,906,000.

VACCINE INJURY COMPENSATION PROGRAM TRUST FUND

For payments from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund, such sums as may be necessary for claims associated with vaccine-related injury or death with respect to vaccines administered after September 30, 1988, pursuant to subtitle 2 of title XXI of the Public Health Service Act, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That for necessary administrative expenses, not to exceed $3,528,000 shall be available from the Trust Fund to the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION

DISEASE CONTROL, RESEARCH, AND TRAINING

To carry out titles II, III, VII, XI, XV, XVII, XIX, XXI, and XXVI of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) (''PHS Act''), sections 101, 102, 103, 201, 202, 203, 301, and 501 of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 811, 812, 813, 841, 842, 843, 861, and 951), sections 20, 21, and 22 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 669, 670, and 671), title IV of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.), section 501 of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 (8 U.S.C. 1522 note), and for expenses necessary to support activities related to countering potential biological, disease, nuclear, radiological, and chemical threats to civilian populations; including purchase and insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries; and purchase, hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, $6,141,753,000, of which $10,500,000 shall remain available until expended for equipment, construction, and renovation of facilities; of which $581,335,000 shall remain available until expended for the Strategic National Stockpile under section 319F–2 of the PHS Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–6b); of which $50,000,000 shall be available until expended to provide screening and treatment for first response emergency services personnel related to the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center; and of which $122,769,000 for international HIV/AIDS shall remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That in addition, such sums as may be derived from authorized user fees, which shall be credited to this account: *Provided further*, That in addition to amounts provided herein, the following amounts shall be available from amounts available under section 241 of the PHS Act (42 U.S.C. 238j): (1) $12,794,000 to carry out the National Immunization Surveys; (2) $120,000,000 to carry out the National Center for Health Statistics surveys; (3) $24,751,000 to carry out information systems standards development and architecture and applications-based research used at local public health levels; (4) $39,173,000 for Health Marketing; (5) $31,000,000 to carry out Public Health Research; and (6) $88,361,000 to carry out research activities within the National Occupational Research Agenda: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available for injury prevention and control at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention may be used, in whole or in part, to advocate or promote gun control: *Provided further*, That up to $31,800,000 shall be made available until expended for Individual Learning Accounts for full-time equivalent employees of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: *Provided further*, That the Director may redirect the total amount made available under authority of section 3 of the Vaccine and Immunization Amendments of 1990 (Public Law 101–502) to activities the Director may so designate: *Provided further*, That the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate are to be notified promptly of any such transfer: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $12,500,000 may be available for making grants under section 1509 of the PHS Act (42 U.S.C. 300n–4a) to not more than 15 States, tribes, or tribal organizations: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated, $10,000 is for official reception and representation expenses when specifically approved by the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated may be used to implement section 2625 of the PHS Act (42 U.S.C. 300ff–33): *Provided further*, That employees of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or the Public Health Service, both civilian and Commissioned Officers, detailed to States, municipalities, or other organizations under authority of section 214 of the PHS Act (42 U.S.C. 215), shall be treated as non-Federal employees for reporting purposes only and shall not be included within any personnel ceiling applicable to the Agency, Service, or the Department of Health and Human Services during the period of detail or assignment.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 281 et seq.) with respect to cancer, $4,870,382,000, of which up to $8,000,000 may be used for facilities repairs and improvements at the NCI–Frederick Federally Funded Research and Development Center in Frederick, Maryland.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

Page 80, line 2, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 41, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, the amendment that I'm offering tonight is a very simple, straightforward one. As was just read, it would remove $10 million from a program that was in fact zeroed out in the Bush administration's budget request, and then use those dollars, that money to increase the level of funding currently appropriated to the National

Cancer Institute at the National Institutes of Health.

Madam Chairman, some time ago President Nixon unofficially declared a war on cancer in his State of the Union Address back in 1971. Since then much progress has been made in the area of cancer research, thankfully. And over the last 3½ decades, science and research has continued to break down barriers in the fight against this dreadful disease.

Today, cancer is no longer the mystery disease that it once was, and researchers know infinitely more now today about the prevention, the detection and the treatment of the disease than ever before in history.

□ 2015

The results from all of this research is now beginning to bear fruit on people's lives every day. Fewer people are dying from cancer in 2004 than they were in 2003, according to the studies. An American public is witnessing declining rates for most major cases, including breast cancer, prostate cancer, and colorectal cancer as well.

So, Madam Chairman, I think that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has done a good job for increasing the budget of the National Cancer Institute this year in the bill, and Republicans supported a doubling of the budget at the National Institutes of Health in past sessions. I supported that. But I think we can do just a little bit more.

The account that this amendment would take from is the Alaska Native Education Equity program. That is a program, like we hear so often on this floor, that is basically a redundant program that the President has eliminated in his budget request. According to the administration, the Alaska Native students already receive benefits from the department in Indian education programs, which provide more than $118 million in formula grants to school districts and competitive grants for demonstration and professional development programs.

Now, Madam Chairman, when we consider how the Federal Government is prioritizing its spending, which really is what it is all about when we come to the floor on each and every one of these amendments, I submit that funding cancer research is more important than spending additional redundant money on a redundant Federal program.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I make a point of order against the gentleman's amendment.

The amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read. The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because the amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chairman, we have had a number of amendments that have dealt with line items at one point in the bill and then at a point later in the bill that has not been read yet, so I would respectfully suggest that the point of order is not appropriate as it has not been utilized on other amendments that have been offered and that all Members ought to be treated with equity in the offering of their amendments.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, if I may be heard further, that is a very quaint interpretation of the House rules. And, nonetheless, it does not at all address the fact that the amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill, which I assume as a good conservative, the gentleman would be opposed to.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I would like to be heard on the objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. The objection, if I understand it correctly, is that the assertion is that this increases the total of number of outlays for the bill. That would be the case if we are simply asking for an increase of $10 million for the Cancer Research Institute, but that is not what we are asking to be done. We are simply asking that $10 million in one line, Page 41, line 7, be increased by the $10 million but another line, page 80 line 2, after the first dollar amount insert, ''would be reduced by $10 million.'' So in point of fact, this amendment does not increase the total net dollar output of the underlying bill. It is a balanced amount. No increase, no decrease.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, if I might point out to the gentleman, just because it is neutral in budget authority does not mean it is neutral in outlays. It is not neutral in outlays, and, therefore, it is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

To be considered en bloc pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI, an amendment must not propose to increase the levels of budget authority or outlays in the bill. Because the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey proposes a net increase in the level of outlays in the bill, as argued by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, it may not avail itself of clause 2(f) to address portions of the bill not yet read.

The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL HEART, LUNG, AND BLOOD INSTITUTE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 281 et seq.) with respect to cardiovascular, lung, and blood diseases, and blood and blood products, $2,965,775,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL AND CRANIOFACIAL RESEARCH

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 281 et seq.) with respect to dental disease, $395,753,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DIABETES AND DIGESTIVE AND KIDNEY DISEASES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 281 et seq.) with respect to diabetes and digestive and kidney disease, $1,731,893,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NEUROLOGICAL DISORDERS AND STROKE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 281 et seq.) with respect to neurological disorders and stroke, $1,559,106,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ALLERGY AND INFECTIOUS DISEASES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 281 et seq.) with respect to allergy and infectious diseases, $4,632,019,000: *Provided*, That $300,000,000 may be made available to International Assistance Programs ''Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Malaria, and Tuberculosis'', to remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That such sums obligated in fiscal years 2003 through 2007 for extramural facilities construction projects are to remain available until expended for disbursement, with prior notification of such projects to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MUSGRAVE

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. MUSGRAVE:

Page 42, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $175,000)''.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Madam Chairman, the bill we are debating today will direct $300 million to the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria. This is an organization that was founded to fight deadly diseases in the world's poorest countries.

Madam Chairman, I have learned that the Global Fund's former executive director was spending money on activities well outside of its intended mission. According to a Boston Globe article which broke a story last February, the former executive director of the Global Fund frequently used Global Fund dollars in ways most of us, especially the American taxpayers, would find reckless.

Global Fund documents say he spent between $91 and $930 per day for limousines in London, Paris, Rome, Washington and San Francisco, averaging $376 a day. He spent $1,695 for a dinner for 12 at the United States Senate dining room here in Washington, D.C.; $225.86 to rent a suit; $8,780 for a boat cruise on Lake Geneva in Switzerland; $8,436 for a dinner in Switzerland for 63 people; $5,150 for a meal and drinks for 74 staff members at a retreat in Switzerland. The Global Fund documents cited other spending that included buying flowers for staff members and champagne at a retreat.

Madam Chairman, this sounds like American tax dollars being spent to improve the lifestyle of Global Fund employees. If you add up all the lavish spending just listed in the Boston Globe article, it comes to $24,512.72. At a dollar a dose, that money could have saved the lives of 24,514 infants from dying from malaria. That money could

have protected almost 5,000 families from being infected with malaria for a year at the cost of about $5 to spray a house with the cheapest insecticide.

Madam Chairman, the United States has contributed almost $3 billion to the Global Fund since 2001. I want to make sure that the Global Fund knows that the American people are watching the way they are spending their hard-earned dollars, and I want the director of the Global Fund to know that he is accountable to the United States taxpayers. And that is why my amendment reduces his salary from $320,000 a year to $145,000 a year, which is equal to the salary of the United States Global Fund AIDS coordinator.

I ask for support for my amendment. This is a shot over the bow to let the Global Fund know that we want American tax dollars spent to save lives, not to give lavish lifestyles to the Global Fund employees.

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

Ms. LEE. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Madam Chairman, I rise to strongly oppose the amendment proposed by the gentlewoman from Colorado.

First of all, as one who wrote the initial legislation that established the framework for the Global Fund, I want the gentlewoman to know that the Global Fund is the only international organization multilateral that is providing for care, prevention and treatment of those living with HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis. It is a very successful effort. We have major international partners. We are the largest contributor to the fund. And I believe, and she can correct me if I am wrong, that the cut that she is talking about references a prior director of the fund who is no longer there. And, in fact, the fund has reorganized, is moving forward, and is doing quite well. And we discussed this in the subcommittee and we had testimony. We met with the officers and directors, the new executive director of the funds, and I would hate to see us cut a nickel from the Global Fund because we need every dime we can get to make sure that we address this global pandemic that is killing so many, especially those in sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean.

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, could I inquire of the gentleman from New York, is the gentleman from New York intending to accept the amendment on his side?

Mr. WALSH of New York. I do, Madam Chairman.

Mr. OBEY. Then I would suggest accepting the amendment on this side. This is an amendment that does nothing, Madam Chairman, except, in my view, it is an effort to put people on the hook by ratifying some unacceptable conduct by someone who is no longer associated with the program. I don't intend to be associated with that kind of a problem, and so I think this is one of those nuisance amendments that is meant to enable someone to pose for political holy pictures without much effect.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 2030

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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:

An amendment by Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.

An amendment by Mr. PLATTS of Pennsylvania.

An amendment by Mr. MARCHANT of Texas.

An amendment by Mr. JINDAL of Louisiana.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. SESSIONS of Texas.

Remaining postponed votes will be taken at a later time.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KLINE OF MINNESOTA

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) 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 186, noes 237, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 642]

AYES—186

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—237

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Ellison
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor

Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Rodriguez
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Bordallo
Brown, Corrine
Culberson
Davis, Jo Ann
Edwards
Feeney
Hastert
Kucinich
Marchant
McMorris Rodgers
Rangel
Tancredo
Young (AK)

□ 2051

Messrs. WELCH of Vermont, PALLONE and PERLMUTTER and Mrs. BIGGERT changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. HOBSON, GILCHREST and PICKERING 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. PLATTS

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) 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 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 250, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 643]

AYES—174

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Boyda (KS)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Cleaver
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cubin
Cuellar
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hobson
Holt
Hulshof
Hunter
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Keller
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Langevin
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mahoney (FL)
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McNerney
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Watt
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—250

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Campbell (CA)
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Ellison
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hensarling
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mack
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Poe
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Bordallo
Brown, Corrine
Culberson
Davis, Jo Ann
Edwards
Hastert
Kucinich
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Rangel
Tancredo
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 1 minute remains in this vote.

□ 2057

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

Mr. FORBES and Mr. MCHUGH 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. MARCHANT

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT) 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 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 149, noes 277, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 644]

AYES—149

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)

Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rehberg
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wolf

NOES—277

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Regula
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Bordallo
Brown, Corrine
Culberson
Davis, Jo Ann
Edwards
Hastert
Kucinich
Rangel
Tancredo
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 1 minute remains in this vote.

□ 2105

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas 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. JINDAL

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JINDAL) 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 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 243, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 645]

AYES—183

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boren
Boustany
Boyda (KS)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carney
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cubin
Cuellar
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Engel
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green, Gene
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Schwartz
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shuler
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Space
Stearns
Sullivan
Tanner
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—243

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNulty

Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Bordallo
Brown, Corrine
Culberson
Davis, Jo Ann
Edwards
Hastert
Kucinich
Rangel
Tancredo
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). One minute remains in the vote.

□ 2109

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) 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 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 251, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 646]

AYES—173

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Young (FL)

NOES—251

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Bordallo
Brown, Corrine
Culberson
Davis, Jo Ann
Edwards
Hastert
Kucinich
McCaul (TX)
Rangel
Tancredo
Waters
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). One minute remains in the vote.

□ 2114

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WALZ of Minnesota) having assumed the chair, Mrs. TAUSCHER, 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. 3043) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 2115

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on July 12, 2007, during consideration of H.R. 1851, the Section 8 Voucher Reform Act, my vote on final passage was not recorded. I respectfully request that the RECORD reflect that had my vote been recorded properly on rollcall 629, it would have been registered as an ''aye.''

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE VIETNAM EDUCATION FOUNDATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 205(a) of the Vietnam Education Foundation Act of 2000 (P.L. 106–554), and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the

Board of Directors of the Vietnam Education Foundation:

Upon the recommendation of the majority leader:

Mr. BLUMENAUER, Oregon.

Upon the recommendation of the minority leader:

Mr. PITTS, Pennsylvania.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

RAMOS/COMPEAN CASE

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, a long awaited Senate judiciary hearing on the prosecution of border agents Ramos and Compean occurred today. I was impressed with the Chair, Senator DIANE FEINSTEIN from California, and the questioning of Senator JOHN CORNYN of Texas at the hearing.

The hearing brought to light the overzealous, overreacting and overreaching prosecution of these two Border Patrol agents, Ramos and Compean. It also showed us and the American public the difficulty our border protectors have on the U.S.-Mexico border.

Chief Aguilar of the Border Patrol said today that violence against border agents has increased. In just the first 4 days of last week, 11 assaults occurred against border agents. Over 2,000 assaults have occurred in the last 2½ years, and 12 officers have been killed in the last few years.

Not only is the border violent because of drug cartels, but violence occurs against these border agents. The border is not Disneyland, but the U.S. Attorney's Office showed they are living in Never Neverland by their relentless determination to see that these agents went to prison for 11 and 12 years a piece for just doing their job on the U.S.-Mexico border.

Much was said today, but I want to concentrate on the U.S. Government's main witness, the drug dealer who appears to have been a bought-and-paid-for witness that received immunity from prosecution. He received a get-out-of-jail-free card, received free medical attention for his wounds at the taxpayers' expense, and blanket amnesty to cross and recross the Texas-Mexico border whenever he wished. All this so he would testify against the two border agents, Ramos and Compean.

Mr. Speaker, as a former judge, it has been my experience that when prosecutors make deals with criminals in return for testimony, they usually get the testimony they want from the criminal, and the same is to be said in this case here.

These agents were sent to prison because one of them shot a drug dealer bringing in $1 million worth of drugs into the United States. The agents probably violated some Homeland Security policies, and maybe they should have been sanctioned or even fired, but to let the drug dealer go free because the agents violated a policy was an error in judgment on the part of our own government.

And the U.S. Attorney's Office had two choices, Mr. Speaker. They had the choice to prosecute a drug dealer bringing in $1 million worth of drugs, or they had the choice to prosecute two border agents that violated some policy, and our government chose poorly.

Of course, the Mexican Government got involved in this case and wrote an arrogant letter demanding prosecution by our government. It seems to me this may be the basis for the prosecution.

Let me tell you a little bit about this drug dealer. He received immunity from prosecution, but part of his deal was that he would cooperate with the U.S. Border Patrol and Federal prosecutors. The cooperation? Well, he never would tell who he was working for. He named no names of the drug cartels. He did not cooperate at all. And while he was waiting to testify in this case, he criss-crossed the Texas-Mexico border and brought in another load of drugs worth almost $1 million, and the Feds kept that from the jury.

Why wasn't it important to know about this second case? Because the entire prosecution was based on the testimony of the government's star witness, and the jury had the right to know that this drug dealer brought in another load of drugs while waiting to testify. So to judge his credibility as a witness, the jury had the right to know that, and that evidence was kept out at the insistence of the U.S. prosecutors.

The U.S. prosecutor made this drug dealer Aldrede to be some poor mule from Mexico that brought in a load of drugs for a little money for his sick mother down in Mexico, and that was not the case. He was an operative that moved back and forth across the Texas-Mexico border, and we know he brought in at least two loads of drugs just in a short period of time in this case.

This second load of drugs should have been brought to the attention of the jury. The prosecutors never prosecuted this Aldrede for that. They even had a DEA report that recommended prosecution. I've seen that DEA report, and based on my experience, a third-year law student could have prosecuted that case even though the U.S. Attorney's Office says, oh, there's not enough evidence. The jury should have known about this so as to have judged the credibility of this star witness.

So the government chose between border agents to be prosecuted doing their job or a drug dealer testifying and then bringing in drugs into the United States. Our government should be embarrassed about this case.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE ADMINISTRATION'S CASE FOR WAR AGAINST IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, for years the administration has been rigging its case for war against Iran with posturing, finger-wagging and name calling. Those are not my words. One of my hometown daily newspapers, the Seattle Post Intelligencer, authored those words as the first sentence of an editorial they published this morning entitled: ''Iran: No, not again.'' I will insert the Seattle PI editorial into the RECORD at this point.

[From the Seattle Post-Intelligener Editorial Board, July 17, 2007]

IRAN: NO, NOT AGAIN

For years, this administration has been rigging its case for war against Iran, with posturing, finger wagging and name-calling.

And now, just as Iran has struck an agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency for inspection of its nuclear plants, and just as the IAEA chief, Mohamed ElBaradei, has said that country is slowing progress on one of those facilities, the United Kingdom's Guardian newspaper reports that Vice President Dick Cheney is pushing for a military ''solution'' in Iran. Naturally, President Bush is backing him, going against Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Defense Secretary Robert Gates, both of whom favor diplomacy over military action (heck, it worked with North Korea).

In May, Cheney paid a visit to the USS John C. Stennis in the Persian Gulf, 150 miles off Iran's coast, for no other reason than to deliver threats. The New York Times reported that while Cheney said nothing new, he ''stitched all of those warnings together, and the symbolism of sending the administration's most famous hawk to deliver the speech so close to Iran's coast was unmistakable.''

The U.S. rode roughshod over ElBaradei's insistence that Iraq didn't have weapons of mass destruction (he was right). And look where we are now. More than 3,000 American troops and tens of thousands of Iraqis dead in war that defies reason and sees no end. We fear the same might happen in Iran.

The fact is, the mainstream newspapers at home and around the world

are expressing grave concerns over what they fear may be the sequel to Iraq, namely, a military strike against Iran.

One of the sources used by the PI editorial is the Guardian newspaper of the United Kingdom which published a story yesterday with this headline: ''Cheney Pushes Bush to Act on Iran.''

The Guardian reports that: ''The balance in the internal White House debate over Iran has shifted back in favor of military action before President George Bush leaves office in 18 months.''

Ominously, the story adds: ''Although the Bush administration is in deep trouble over Iraq, it remains focused on Iran. A well-placed source in Washington said, 'Bush is not going to leave office with Iran still in limbo.' ''

Thoughtful newspapers and other worldwide people believe the Vice President is pushing for a military strike against Iran. The Vice President's presence and speech aboard an aircraft carrier near Iran in mid-May sent an unmistakable message, says the New York Times.

As the Guardian reports, The Vice President is winning the war for war inside the administration, and now the American people have to be brought along. That means the administration and its surrogates will make the data say what they need it to say.

We're already beginning to see how a new national intelligence assessment released just today will be manipulated. The report makes a persuasive and fact-driven case for getting our soldiers out of Iraq, because the President shifted away from the real war against terrorism to pursue his own agenda in Iraq.

But instead of a sober assessment of what's gone wrong in Iraq, we're hearing that terrorists have reconstituted their operations inside Iran. And the insinuation for military action is clear.

Like many, I would like to know what's really going on in Iran and what Iranian leaders are thinking and doing. Well, where can we turn for an assessment we can trust? We know the Vice President wants to use deadly force in Iran. We know that there are credible media reports that say the Vice President is winning the war to go to war with Iran. So how are we going to get accurate and reliable information from this administration or anyone associated with it?

Today, the State Department announced it wants a new meeting directly with Iran to talk face-to-face, government-to-government. Ordinarily, I would see this as a welcome, even positive, sign that the administration has finally begun to see the wisdom in diplomacy.

Is that the case, or is an announcement that comes on the same day as the New Intelligence Estimate a sign that the Vice President is about to declare mission accomplished? We don't know the answer, and we don't know what happened in Iraq.

But we do know what happened in Iraq. The PI editorial board reminds us how the administration ran over the International Atomic Energy Agency, its chief, to make a war in Iraq, quoting the PI. Look where we are now, more than 3,000 American troops and tens of thousands of Iraqis dead in a war that defies reason and sees no end. We fear the same may happen in Iran. So do I.

Tell the President not to go after Iran.

□ 2130

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.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

OIL INDUSTRY WILL BE UNABLE TO MEET WORLD DEMAND OVER NEXT 25 YEARS

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, the oil industry admitted this week that it will be unable to meet world demand over the next 25 years. In case anyone still needed a wake-up call about the importance of energy independence, surely, that is that call.

Yesterday's Wall Street Journal reported on page 2 that a U.S. government-commissioned study, a study conducted by the oil industry itself, reveals that oil and gas supplies will not keep pace with worldwide demand through the year 2030.

According to the oil industry study, demand is expected to increase between 50 and 60 percent due to mounting consumption in the developed world, plus the growing economies of China and India.

According to the Journal, the finding suggests that far from being temporary, high energy prices are likely for decades to come. The study's conclusions appear to be the first explicit concession by the petroleum industry itself that it cannot meet the burgeoning global demand for oil, which may rise as much as 120 million barrels a day by 2030 up from 84 million barrels a day currently.

These findings are consistent with what the United States Government already reported in February through the Energy Information Administration of the U.S. Department of Energy. They projected world liquids demand to increase to 117 million barrels per day in 2030.

They also projected the real price of crude oil in 2030 to be about $95 in nominal terms, which would be over $59 a barrel in this year's dollars, and the price of natural gas to be $9.50 per 1,000 cubic feet. In other words, the U.S. Government itself, through the Energy Information Administration, an arm of our Department of Energy, acknowledges we will become more dependent on foreign energy in coming years. Not less dependent, but more dependent. Not more independent, but more dependent. To me, that is not acceptable.

For the consumer, it means higher and higher gasoline prices. For the economy, it means higher trade deficits and slower growth. For our Government, for our Nation, it means less independence, greater entanglements and likely more wars.

President Bush has talked about energy independence. But what has he really done? In his most recent State of the Union, he talked about ending our addiction to oil and everybody dutifully applauded, but we are more dependent on foreign energy sources today than we were 6 years ago when he mouthed the words, indeed. Under his administration, this country is importing 1 billion more barrels of oil since he first took office. Today, we are importing three-quarters of the petroleum it takes to drive this economy.

Now, the Presidential candidates are criss-crossing our country, and each candidate has a piece in their stump speech that mentions the words, ''energy independence.'' But will any of them deliver anything significant on these promises?

I have introduced a number of bills which will move America toward real energy independence. My Biofuels Energy Independence Act of 2007, H.R. 2218, protects our feedstocks from commodity price distortions, and we see what's happening in the ethanol market and the biodiesel market today. We ought to have broad ownership of that industry and not allow the cartelized structure that characterizes today's oil and gas industry to be repeated in this new biofuels sector.

I am proud to be part of a coalition here supporting H.R. 969, a bill to expand the renewable energy standard and the renewable energy portfolio to spawn new energy production in this country and new business and new jobs related to it, to capture all those dollars that we are siphoning up and sending to other countries, to turn those around and bring them back home.

I have a bill to supplement the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, H.R. 682, with domestically produced biofuels. Soon I will be introducing the Energy Smart Communities Act that encourages and aids local jurisdiction undertaking energy efficiency initiatives, including solar roofs and wind turbines across our country.

My goal has always been simple, to devote the resources it will take to reinvent our economy and transform our

energy portfolio in this century, in the first decade of this century. Our Nation is, indeed, at a crossroads, and the stakes are in plain sight. Do we travel the road of independence, creating jobs here at home, making affordable energy available to our consumers and businesses, or do we remain in the grip of the petrol kingdoms of the Middle East?

Do we issue a new declaration of energy and independence from foreign control, or do we allow our foreign policy to be perverted by our addiction to oil? Do we get serious about climate change and move aggressively to develop cleaner, safer, alternative fuels, or do we leave our future in the hands of the world oil oligarchy? The choice is ours.

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 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 New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RECOGNIZING THE 33RD ANNIVERSARY OF TURKEY'S ILLEGAL INVASION OF CYPRUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, tonight I join some of my colleagues on the House floor to remember a horrific act taken by Turkey against the citizens of Cyprus 30 years ago. On July 20, 1974, the nation of Turkey violated international law when it brutally invaded the sovereign Republic of Cyprus. Following the Turkish invasion, 200,000 people were forcibly displaced from their homes, and a large number of Cypriots, who were captured during the invasion, are still missing today.

Until 3 years ago, both Democratic and Republican administrations here in the U.S. consistently condemned the Turkish government for its illegal occupation and pressured the government to come to the negotiating table in an attempt to finally reunify Cyprus.

Past administrations understood that the invading nation of Turkey was to blame for the division and should therefore be punished accordingly. As a result, past administration specifically forbid trade with the illegal government of the occupied north. Our government also prohibited direct flights into the occupied north. As long as Turkey continued its intransigence and refused to leave Cyprus, U.S. administrations correctly believed they should not be rewarded.

While this has been consistent U.S. policy, I have grown increasingly concerned that over the past 3 years we have witnessed a blatant shift in Cypriot policy from the Bush administration, specifically from Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice. The Bush administration is punishing Cyprus for overwhelmingly voting in a democratic election against the United Nations Annan Plan.

The U.S. State Department and Secretary Rice seem more interested in rewarding those who illegally occupied the northern third of the nation back in 1974, than in actually reunifying the island. Over the past 2 years, our State Department decided to allow Americans to fly into the occupied north in direct violation of international law and the law of the Republic of Cyprus.

I joined many of my colleagues from the Congressional Hellenic Caucus in objecting to this action. The State Department responded by saying that it was interested in encouraging the elimination of unnecessary restrictions and barriers that isolate and impede the economic development of the Turkish Cypriot community.

Unfortunately, it didn't end there. The State Department pursued the option of resuming trade with the occupied north, a direct violation of both domestic law in Cyprus and international law.

I am deeply concerned that the State Department's drastic policy reversal towards the government, and the people of the occupied north, will only delay reunification of the entire island. If the U.S. allows direct trade through routes in the north, what incentives do the illegal occupiers have to make any concessions? It's as if the State Department has completely forgotten who is responsible for the invasion of Cyprus in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, the Annan Plan was unfair to the Cypriots in many ways, but the issues of property were the ones of most concern to many of the Cypriot Americans that I have talked to. Cypriot Americans are among the refugees that are being denied access to their property by Turkey.

Since these Americans cannot return to their illegally seized property, I believe these Cypriot Americans should be allowed to seek financial remedies with either the current inhabitants of the land or the Turkish government itself.

Earlier this year I introduced the bipartisan American Owned Property in Occupied Cyprus Claims Act. This legislation authorizes the President to initiate a claims program under which the claims of U.S. nationals, who Turkey has excluded from their property, can be judged before the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

If this commission determined that Cypriot Americans should be compensated for their property, negotiations would then take place between the U.S. and Turkey to determine the proper compensation. My legislation would also empower U.S. district courts to hear causes of action against either the individuals who now occupy those properties or the Turkish government.

For 35 years now the people of Cyprus have been denied their independence and freedom because of a foreign aggressor. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in remembering what the Cypriot people have suffered and continue to suffer at the hands of the Turks.

I also urge my colleagues to join me in pressuring the Bush administration to return to a policy that once again takes into consideration that entire 33-year history of this conflict. The people of Cyprus deserve nothing less.

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 New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York 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 Florida (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WELDON of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 2145

ENERGY SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight to talk about energy security. We have talked about energy independence, and I think that is a subset of energy security.

We have to look at the world in total, and we have to realize that we need to secure our own energy sources if we are going to secure the future of our country. Even as I look at probably the most immediate issue, the war with terrorists, their actions against us, but if we take that and look at the world in total, when I see the lowest common denominator, it's energy. It is a fight or a battle for energy.

Those who are going to be able to power themselves without relying on others will not only have more options and purer choices in foreign policy

matters, but the reality is in this new emerging global economy, those that cannot be economically hijacked by foreign countries are going to be the winners. I want to make sure that we have a policy in place that recognizes the need for independence so that we can secure our future.

Now this means that we have to do some things. I don't know how many of you out there remember high school economics. I remember Mr. Croft's lessons at Northwest High School, and basic supply and demand.

When we look at resolving our energy issues, and, by the way, a barrel of oil hit over $75 today, we have to look at both sides of the equation. That's what we tried to do in 2005, the energy bill that was signed by the President. We tried to increase the amount of supply of energy and, at the same time, looking at how to conserve or reduce the demand for energy in our country.

Now, overlaying this discussion about energy, supply and demand, is a new discussion amongst us about global warming. This is driving our discussions on energy today. I fear that we have become, how do I say this, but so spooked by global warming that we are willing to go to the extreme and hurt ourselves.

And I really believe that part of my role and the role of the minority party here is maybe to swing back to a more practical level as we talk about energy and global warming.

Now, what a lot of people don't know when we talk about global warming or the CO_2 emissions, that is the gas that is depleting our ozone, the vast majority of that is created naturally, not by humans. Yes, human activity that I am going to talk about in a minute does contribute to that.

Now, as I understand, the major contributor and the most significant contributor to CO_2 emissions is livestock. So, of course, some have joined hands with PETA to make sure that we eliminate all the cattle, pigs, chickens, and we should just become vegetarians.

The next is humans. Not by our activity of burning coal and the coal-generated electrical plant, but just ourselves and our existence, our exhaling. And, therefore, we should have mandated policies to control population, i.e., abortion, and reduce the number of people on Earth. That is one of the policies out there.

Now, the discussion that we are going to have here in the House in the next 2 weeks is going to be on what energy policies do we implement here to lower CO_2 emissions and become energy independent. Well, the reality of it is, the policies that we are going to hear from the majority party will help to some small degree on the demand side and absolutely drive up or put more pressures, increased pressures, on supply, because they are going to eliminate some of our sources that we use for energy, make it more difficult and more costly to use and, therefore, create bigger demand. What happens when there is bigger demand? Prices go up.

So any of you out there that want to turn on a light, use your computer, heat or cool your homes, drive to work, under the policies that we are looking at adopting in this House over the next couple weeks, expect to pay more.

Now, this is why I think it is becoming so important here. I want to get back to our supply-and-demand lesson here. In this chart, the United States, because of our economic engine, our ingenuity, our intellectual properties that are being put into action, we are the largest consuming Nation. Now, look down here, we also rank number one in oil importation. We have to import to drive our economy, literally drive our economy, about 65 percent of our energy needs. Now, that is 12 billion barrels that we have to import.

When I think of energy, I have to separate it into two different issues. One is driving. About two-thirds of the oil that we import goes to refining into gasoline, to use in jet fuel and trucks to move goods from one place to another, as well as cars to get us to the grocery store, to get us back to work. If we are going to become independent, we have to look at a full array of fuels that we can generate here. That means biofuels to some extent. That means that we adopt policies on hybrid type of cars or other experimental cars that are out there. And, by the way, that does lower emissions. But remember, car emissions are pretty far down the list of what actually contributes to CO_2 emissions and the ozone. We can then look at a lot of other technologies. I am a proponent of hydrogen, for example.

Now, let's look at the other side of generating electricity that powers our economy and is part of the equation. Most of our electrical generation, about 52 percent nationally, is from coal. In the policies adopted by various committees of this House and that are going to be brought to the floor in some capacity either in the next 2 weeks or maybe even September, they make it much more difficult to use coal. I mentioned, 52 percent of the electricity in this Nation is generated from coal. In my district, it is over 70 percent. It is the cheapest way to generate electricity. It is plentiful. We have something like a 500-year supply of coal to generate electricity in this country.

So I feel that instead of doing what the majority party wants to do and shut down coal-fired plants, crippling our ability to generate electricity; and, by the way, nuclear is bad, too. Remember that, no nuclear power? Let's make it as difficult. Let's not find ways to deal with the waste. And so if we shut down coal, make it more costly at least to do it, no nuclear, that means you have one area to really rely on in generating electricity, and that is natural gas. Oh, and by the way, our policies don't allow for any more domestic supply of natural gas and oil, so we are going to shift everything to natural gas to generate. We barely allow it to be imported. We can't drill any more for it within our own 48 continental United States or offshore any more than we are doing today.

I don't understand this energy policy that is going to be brought to us. It seems to me to be a negative energy policy. In fact, I think the only energy that is involved in this bill is perhaps if we burn the darn thing we could generate some power. But, as was just mentioned to me, that would result in CO_2 emission, so we can't even do that.

Mr. Speaker and the American public, we need to become more engaged in this. We are on a path to cripple our economy. China is adding at least one new power plant a week based on coal. They have no problems using coal. I saw a statistic that was 2 years old, so it is probably much more significant now, but the Chinese were adding 120,000 cars per day. That is not even talking about India, whose economy is expanding at near double digits as well, and they are adding power in their cars.

The competition is extreme for oil. We need to recognize that. We need to expand it. That doesn't mean that we shut down our domestic fossil fuels. That means we add to it so that we become independent and secure our Nation's future.

At this time, I yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank my friend from Nebraska hosting this hour tonight. We listened earlier tonight to one of our colleagues from Ohio who recited some of the same statistics that you and I work off of, and that is, most reputable projections of energy usage in this country by 2025 and 2030 shows that, no matter what, even the rosiest predictions show that we still will be importing millions of barrels of crude oil and refined products every single day. And I don't know of any of us who thinks that America is better off by importing crude oil and refined products. Most of us would agree that that is a bad thing. Our balance of payments is out of whack.

As you mentioned earlier, our foreign policy options are different. Our risks and threats to this country are exacerbated by that dependence. And then you begin to talk about the solutions. We agree on those facts. It is kind of looking at the glass half full or half empty. The amount of water in the glass is the same; it is just how do we look at it. And the proposals that she began to tout and promote seem to cost American taxpayers an awful lot of money. They also seem to involve some sort of price-control scheme that would not allow the natural market forces to work and operate as we begin to export these ideas.

We will hear, as you said, over the next 2 weeks a lot of policies, and I think we ought to look at those polices through a lens that has four pieces. One lens would say does this policy help or hurt domestic production of crude oil and natural gas.

I am a CPA by trade and I operate pretty often just by straight logic, and the logic is that if we increase domestic production of crude oil and natural gas, it means we are less dependent on foreign sources of crude oil and natural gas. I have yet to have anybody refute that argument in any way that makes sense. So, promoting production of crude oil and natural gas I think is a positive. So as you look at their policies, challenge them.

If their policy continues to close off areas of domestic production and domestic exploration like ANWR, like the Inner Continental Shelf, then that policy does not make sense for America today. And many of the policies they have in place or want to continue in place have that result.

If their policies retard or restrict the construction of new refineries in this country, the ability to process our domestic crude into refined products, gasoline, jet fuels and other kind of things, and force us to import refined products, it seems to me that that is a policy we ought to challenge.

We in the minority spend a lot of time being against stuff, and I guess that is pretty much our role, but part of that is to be responsible devil's advocates. And if a policy curtails domestic production of crude oil and natural gas, that seems to be on its face something that you and I can challenge pretty easily.

The second lens would be does it increase our reliance on foreign sources of crude oil. And in this category, it would be things like does it promote or inhibit personal responsibility for conservation.

Republicans get beat up about not being wanting to conserve and wanting to use less fuel, but at the heart of that is the personal responsibility to use a little less gasoline than you used last week. The idea is that if all of us would use just 1 gallon of gasoline next week, if we did that, you would see an immediate increase of inventories. You would see a drop in the prices because the folks holding those inventories are wanting to sell them and sell them at a profit.

So policies that either encourage personal responsibility for conservation or discourage personal responsibility for conservation, I think we have got to be for and against. If it encourages that and those policies come forward in the next couple of weeks, I think we ought to back those policies and help us do a better job making good choices ourselves, goofy little thing like keeping the tires in our car aired up properly, taking all the extra weight out of the trunk. Doing those kinds of things, you would probably pick up 3, 4, 5 percent efficiencies in the use of gasoline and see a dramatic impact. Just using less, that helps reduce our imported refined products. So policies that they bring forward that increase our reliance on foreign sources of crude oil and natural gas, I think we have to challenge those.

The third would be does it encourage private investment in all sources of domestic energy, and that includes oil and natural gas. It includes coal, nuclear, wind and solar, and all those kinds of things that are out there.

Mr. TERRY. Your vision would include wind energy, solar energy?

Mr. CONAWAY. Yes. Let me say this: Even if the occasional turbine helped a bird commit suicide, yes, I would encourage wind turbines.

Mr. TERRY. So in one of the bills in one of our committees, it specifically makes it a criminal act to have a turbine that would contribute to the death of a migrating bird. Does that help or hinder the rollout of that alternative energy?

Mr. CONAWAY. Well, that folds into this exact policy, because things of uncertain public policies contribute to a decrease in private investment solutions.

Mr. TERRY. You mean, if an investor might go to jail because a bird flies into a turbine under one of the bills that may come to this floor in the next couple of weeks, that would hinder investment?

Mr. CONAWAY. You would think it would.

Uncertainties about tax policies. How is a particular investment taxed and treated under our code over an extended period of time or changes in that policy contribute to a reduction in the private investment in these various sources. Other government initiatives, like things like the government picking winners and losers in a particular area as opposed to looking to the market to do that, to give incentives to the markets to create the most efficient kinds of policies that are in place. But, nevertheless, anything that comes in front of this body that retards or discourages or puts in question the private investment into all domestic sources of energy, I think we have to challenge those, and respectfully.

And the fourth lens I would look at is what does this do to the consumers. At the end of the day, you and I and the people who pay the light bills when we turn the switch on, who buy the gasoline at the pump have to pay those costs.

□ 2200

And if we do things as a part of these policy initiatives that come forward over the next couple of weeks that arbitrarily and capriciously increase costs to consumers, then we need to challenge those. There has to be a pay the fiddler at some point in time. I mean, we have to pay for whatever sources of energy that we've had. We've enjoyed low gasoline prices for a long, long time, and we're coming to the end of those lower prices just because crude oil and natural gas are finite resources.

You've already mentioned the increase in demand from around the world that we're in competition with those. And it's not likely that we'll see a significant decrease in the price of gasoline.

On the one hand, high gasoline prices help us to look at doing things a different way. They help make other alternatives more viable for the consumer, because at the end of the day, the consumer across this country has to be willing to pay the cost for whatever it is you're talking about. You can't subsidize. You can't use government programs to overcome lack of a consumer participation.

So any of these now policies that cause cost to consumers to go up arbitrarily and too quickly I think we have to challenge.

Let me make one final point that you talked about, and that is converting either coal or nuclear plants to natural gas fired plants. Natural gas does not transport across oceans well. We've got to liquefy it. We've got to put it into tankers. We've got to have facilities for regasification and all those kinds things, and so importing natural gas is very difficult in comparison to how easy it is to import crude oil.

So as we increase on natural gas, our local domestic cost for natural gas will go up. They're already the highest cost for natural gas in the world and because we are relying on it so much.

The other point is that if all 38 nuclear permits that are currently in some form of approval are approved and those plants are built in the next 20 years, nuclear power will still represent only 20 percent of our demand. So if we're going to have nuclear that's going to actually help lessen the load on natural gas, then we've got to have a nuclear plant increase from where just the current system, the current new plants and new facilities and existing plants are in process.

So as we look at these policies that come at us over the next couple of weeks, let's use common sense. Let's look at things that can be rolled out in a scope that makes sense. It's one thing to be able to do something on a very tiny, microscopic scale. But unless you can convert that into a significant portion of the demand or the supply of energy, whether it's electricity or gasoline or other sorts, other forms of energy that we use day in and day out, then you're barking up a tree and you're not helping the circumstance.

So we've got some work to do, being in the minority, over the next couple of weeks to help point out the areas where we think these policies that are coming forward fail the American consumer.

Mr. TERRY. I appreciate your comments and putting more meat onto the bones here. And I'll mention that in my district, again, it's about 70 percent, almost 70 percent coal. We do have nuclear. We use natural gas only as a peaking, which is basically this time of year. It was 99 degrees at home today, and I'll guarantee you Omaha Public Power is running their peaking plant during the day so that people can run their air conditioners. And there's a lot of things that we could do on the conservation side, as you said, and we need to push those.

But at the same time, we seem to be adopting policies that restrict the supply. And I think even though the policies that are going to be proposed here don't necessarily further restrict than already have been natural gas, what they do is move more energy, or force more energy to electrical generation by natural gas without doing anything to increase the supply of that natural gas.

And the gentleman from Pennsylvania has come to the floor many times. He is one of the leaders in the House in discussion of what we need to do to increase supplies of natural gas, and how ridiculous it is that our prices in the United States are probably five times more than anywhere else in the rest of the world.

So I yield to my friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I want to thank my friend from Nebraska for his leadership here tonight and for his sharing time with us.

I personally believe that energy is the Number 1 issue facing America's economic future. I don't think, I think that available, affordable energy is a greater threat to the American economy than terrorism is. That's my personal view.

Before we talk about natural gas, I want to look at what we're using. Now, these are 2004 figures, but they've changed very little. It takes the Energy Department several years to compile them. These are the figures that we made the last chart out of a few months ago.

Currently 40 percent of our energy is petroleum. Just about 22.9 or 23 percent is natural gas, and a similar figure is coal. Now that's 86 percent.

Then you get down here to nuclear, 8.2, and now you're up to 94 percent. So renewables are those figures on the left. And the largest, which surprises a lot of people, is biomass, which was 2.8, hydroelectric, 2.7, geothermal, 0.3, solar, 0.06, and wind, 0.01. Now, I think we need to look at that.

And then we look at the next chart, which is the Energy Department's estimates. Now, these are the people that deal with us every day. In 13 years, in 2020, these figures don't change much, according to their statistics. Now, I hope they're wrong because the energy bills that are coming at us do not deal with petroleum, do not deal with natural gas, certainly do not deal with coal and do not deal with nuclear, which provides 94 percent. And I don't believe they deal with hydroelectric. That's another 3 percent. And so we have about 4 percent that's in play.

And I think what we have to be concerned about, if we focus on that 4 percent, woody biomass, solar, wind, geothermal and hydrogen, can we take care of the needs of this country, because when you don't have emphasis on these, and you don't continue to drill new wells, and you don't continue to promote coal to liquids or coal to gas to furnish our mass amounts of energy needs, then these volumes go down, and that's where we've been at as a country.

We've had a policy not to produce American energy, oil, gas or coal. We are gaining 2 percent foreign dependence every year, so we're at 64 percent. We've been gaining. Since I have been in Congress it's been 2 percent a year, every year. And that's a trend that nobody thinks is appropriate or positive for America because it's foreign, unstable, often unfriendly countries with unstable governments.

Some new statistics that I'll just add to this that are a little concerning; 80-some percent of the oil and gas in the world is owned by countries that do not have democracies, unstable countries. They own the energy of the world. In fact, Exxon, our largest oil company, is 14th in the world in ownership of energy. There are 13 countries that own, starting with Saudi Arabia and Russia and Iran and Iraq, and you can tell that's not exactly our friends, on down the road, all of those types of countries that own the energy of the world, and we are totally dependent.

Now, I'm pleased that the House and the Senate are both going to be dealing with an energy bill, but I think it's important that we have some energy production in those bills.

Now, the natural gas issue is one that has, I think, is really driving us economically in the wrong direction. We use 20 some percent of our natural gas now to make electricity. The gentleman from Nebraska just mentioned that his State doesn't do that, but the country does that. The States of California and Florida, the big users of energy in this country, consume huge amounts of electricity produced by natural gas, and that's an increasing figure daily.

About 12 or 13 years ago we took away the moratorium. It used to be just used for peaking plants in the morning and the evening because people felt natural gas was to precious to use to make electricity.

Natural gas is the feedstock for hydrogen, which the Representative from Nebraska talked about is one of our future fuels. We currently make it out of natural gas. Ethanol, the big push on ethanol consumes huge amounts of natural gas in the production of ethanol, so we don't make ethanol without consuming huge amounts of natural gas. The same with biodiesel. It's the feedstock.

Now, here's where the rubber meets the road in America. Natural gas is an ingredient in almost everything that's manufactured, or it's used in large amounts to heat, treat and bend products.

Petrochemicals, all the petrochemical companies, 55 percent of their cost of producing their chemicals because they use natural gas as an ingredient, they use it as a fuel is natural gas.

Polymers and plastics, 45 to 50 percent of their cost is natural gas because they use it as an ingredient and they use it as a fuel.

Fertilizer, from 50 to 70 percent of the cost of making fertilizer to grow the corn to make the ethanol is made by natural gas. In the last 2 years, 50 percent of our fertilizer production has gone offshore.

Petrochemicals, polymers and plastics are moving offshore. Why? Because America has the highest natural gas prices in the world, and have had for 6 years. That was not true 6 years ago. South America, a buck and a quarter. Our average retail price last year was between 12 and $13. Like I said, we have consistently, for 6 years, had the very highest natural gas prices in the world.

To show you, Dow Chemical uses huge amounts of natural gas. In 2002, they spent $8 billion to buy natural gas. In 2006, they spent $22 billion, and of course those numbers just keep rising.

If we don't deal with the natural gas issue, America will not compete as a nation, because we use natural gas in producing almost all of our products, whether it's melting steel, melting aluminum.

Mr. TERRY. Will the gentleman yield on that?

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Certainly.

Mr. TERRY. Dow Chemical has thousands of employees. They're just one of many petrochemicals that rely on natural gas. If the price of natural gas remains high or goes higher, where do they go? I yield back to you.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. They just committed $32 billion to build new plants in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Libya.

Mr. TERRY. And all of those jobs go to those countries now.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. That's right.

Mr. TERRY. Because of our natural gas policy.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. There's about 100 chemical plants in the world under construction, none in the United States. And that's a tragedy because those are some of the best working man jobs. When you bend steel, when you bend aluminum, when you heat treat products, when you dry grain, you use natural gas. I mean, natural gas heats 60 percent of our homes, heats about 70 percent of our businesses.

Now, if natural gas was affordable, it would be the natural next fuel for vehicles, because we could fuel, if it was affordable, we could fuel a third of our auto fleet and that would be much quicker than CAFE. And I'm not opposed to CAFE. But it would be much quicker than all the things they're talking about because it could displace 2.5 million barrels a day, just for short haul vehicles who don't go long distances. One of the problems with natural gas as a vehicle fuel is distance because you can't store, you can't have a big enough gas tank to run long distances on a tank of natural gas.

But we have, on the Outer Continental Shelf, that's from 3 miles to 200 miles offshore, every country in the world produces both gas and oil there. Now, they may have 20-mile distance out or 30-mile distance out. But they produce, after you pass 11 to 12-mile it's out of sight. And countries around the world, when I tell them we don't produce there, just look at us and they say, why? Norway, Sweden, Great Britain, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, all environmentally sensitive countries, they all produce there. We're the only known modern society that does not produce oil and gas.

Now, I have a proposal that opens it up for gas because we have not been able to pass it. I would support oil, but natural gas is more important to us because how it fuels our industry, how it heats our schools, how it heats our homes, how it heats our hospitals, how it plays such a role in our economy, how it's an ingredient in so many of our products, in fertilizers and petrochemicals and plastics. So we need natural gas.

So I put the priority, and we have a bill that says the first 20 miles remains locked up. The second 25 miles State option, State control, and the next 50 miles is open unless the States pass a bill to lock it up. They can do that. The second hundred miles is just open. That's the bill that I have proposed. And I think it's vital to the future of this country, because if we opened up the Outer Continental Shelf on the East and West Coast and the rest of the gulf we would have ample supply of natural gas for many, many years.

□ 2215

Now, we need to produce other kinds of fuel. I mean, what I think a lot of people are not aware of is there is an energy shortage in the world. In fact, right now OPEC controls the price. I believe the price ends the day at somewhere between $75, $76 for oil. Gas is about 7 bucks, which is the cheapest it has been, but this is the slowest time of year in the use of gas. This is gas that is going into storage that you add a couple, 3 bucks to, and then there are distribution costs, and it comes back out on a next year's average price. And this year the price of gas is higher than last year so far in storage.

So we are going to have a 25 to 30 percent increase in gas prices, and it appears we are going to have, because here we are with not one storm in the gulf, which always disrupts supply. Right at the moment, we don't have a large sending country in trouble with their government. So things are kind of calm, and we have $75 oil, and we are at the high usage time, right in the mid-summer. So now all we have to do is have a storm or two in the gulf, like we did 2 years ago, and have a country have some sort of disturbance or a government overthrown, and we have $85 or $90 oil, and we know what that is going to do to the American economy. In fact, I am not sure we are really sure what $3 gasoline, which is prevalent today, is going to do to the economy long term because we have had spikes for short periods of time. But now, in my view, $3 is the base price, and it is going up from there. It is just a matter of how much it goes up.

I think what is important for Americans and Members of Congress to understand is that we have to really get serious about energy policy for this country. I am for wind and I am for solar and I am for geothermal and I was part of the Hydrogen Caucus when I first came. I am for all of those.

But they are tiny fractions when you look at the amounts they produce. And we also know that wind has its opponents and solar has just had trouble getting off the ground. I mean, it just has trouble growing. I read an article today that said ethanol, the new fuel, we spent $5.1 billion last year, subsidizing that by paying the tax on it. So it doesn't come free. And it seems foolish to me that we as a country now want to buy our natural gas from foreign countries and bring it in ships and be once again dependent.

I have had that argument with a lot of leaders in the last few years that LNG could be part of the solution, but it is not the solution. And that has turned out true because countries like Spain and Japan outbid us because they will pay more for a tanker load of natural gas than we can afford to. So we don't often get it because it becomes a commodity once a ship is loaded. But I want to get across to Members of Congress and to the American people is that we want to be for the clean and green fuels, but I think natural gas is one of those.

Natural gas is one of the cleanest fuels we have. And if we had ample supply of it, we could be expanding the use of it, not just detracting the use of it. It could be our bridge until we figure out how to make cellulosic ethanol, until we figure out how to get hydrogen vehicles, until we figure out how to charge our cars up at night with electric and have batteries that will last and all these things we are working on, we need a bridge to get to them because what is going to happen if we allow ourselves to have $100 oil from foreign countries, unstable governments, who are totally going to own this country?

The major balance of payment, and I will just show you that in conclusion, is the last chart here. This is one on manufacturing decline as natural gas prices have risen. But here is the one on the balance of payment. The major portion of the balance of payment, a huge portion, is energy prices. And as energy prices go up and we continue to import, that figure is going to grow. We could almost cut our balance of payment in half if we stopped importing energy.

Now, we are not going to be able to do that but we could move a long ways. But we need cola liquids. We need to develop the hydrogens and the winds and solars and all of those. We need to do more nuclear. We need all of those because China is increasing their energy usage 15 to 20 percent a year, and they are just drying up the marketplace. They are just sucking it dry because they are, and many other countries, are developing a strong energy portfolio; so they have energy. The United States has done little to secure its economic future with clean, green, affordable energy.

And I hope when we finally pass bills here that we have some energy in them that will secure our economic future with clean, green, affordable energy and specifically natural gas.

Mr. TERRY. I really appreciate your tutorial there. What is our supply in the United States of natural gas? We had the gentlewoman from Ohio that was down here that was talking about petroleum and how limited we may be at our peak here within the next 30 years. How about natural gas?

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. We have anywhere from a 50- to 100-year supply. There are huge amounts in the Midwest, but the Outer Continental Shelf has actually not been measured. But we had old seismographic 40 years ago. Actually this Congress has prevented, and I see the Senate right now is preventing, seismographic from being done in the portion of the gulf that has not been produced.

Mr. TERRY. You mean we won't even be able to measure how much?

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Not only do we prohibit usage but we prohibit the measurement.

Now, there was a lot of drilling off the coast of Florida a few years ago. We bought those leases back. That was very fertile gas. There is very fertile gas up in Georgia, the Carolinas, Virginia, New Jersey. The east coast is loaded with gas, and it is very rich, and it is where the population is. And when you produce in the ocean, it is out of sight. It is beyond the site line. The habitat for fisheries improve. They love to be around the rigs. They love to be around the platforms. And, of course, the underground piping comes in the ground under the water. It is not even seen. It is clean, green fuel. And they talk about it harming a beach. I don't know how gas harms a beach. I have never seen dirty natural gas. It's clean. It doesn't stain anything. It isn't colorful. It's just a gas. So it has been somewhat amazing. We have lots of natural gas.

Mr. TERRY. So just what we know, 50 to 100 years, and, by the way, I understand one of our largest pockets of natural gas that is in Wyoming was made into a Federal monument or a park, making it federally illegal to even drill there. So that is what happens when we find new pockets. We rule them off limits. That just astounds me that we have got that much. And when we are talking about securing our future, wanting to become independent, the other side and us are worried about global warming. And

this is a clean fuel. You have stressed it. It is a clean fuel, which is why the policies that we are seeing are moving electrical generations towards natural gas. It makes no sense to me that we won't increase supply at the same time.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. When we started down that road, natural gas was less than $2 a thousand. And it has hit as high as $14 and $15 in peak periods. But Daniel Yergen, who wrote the book ''The Prize,'' spoke in the Senate shortly after that process started, and I happened to be there with Steve Largent. And he said if we don't open up supply, we are going to make natural gases so high that Americans will struggle to heat their homes, struggle to run their businesses, struggle to heat their hospitals. We are not going to make products in this country much longer that consume a lot of natural gas.

I predict if we don't deal with the natural gas issue, simple things like glass and bricks will be made in Trinidad, where gas is about a buck a thousand. That is not very far from here. Trinidad is in northern South America, probably a boat, a ship, a day away. It wouldn't take long to get to the east coast with a ship of bricks and glass. And that is a tragedy if we start importing those kinds of things that the American working man has made.

This is about jobs for working people. It is about the economy for the working people of this country. Energy punishes the poor and the middle class. The rich will go right along. The rich environmentalists who are against will live right on. They won't change their life-style. They will live in their huge homes and fancy cars and they will do their thing because money is not a problem. But the middle-class working people will not have a middle-class job anymore. They will have a poor man's job. And the poverty rate in this country will skyrocket.

Mr. TERRY. We talked about jobs, that we are losing our manufacturing, our middle class. And what a lot of people don't understand is it is our energy policy that is driving those jobs offshore. Yes, there are some that are offshoring, taking maybe telephone answering jobs over to India. But our policies are driving a lot of our good manufacturing jobs away.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Some of the best jobs in America are producing energy. When you buy Luke Oil gasoline down here, that is produced in Russia, and only the person selling it makes money in America.

Mr. PEARCE can tell you how many people make money because he knows that business in the production of energy. He will give you some great information.

Mr. TERRY. Then let's bring him up.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to my friend from New Mexico.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his discussion on energy security.

And for my discussion tonight, I would like to begin at the same point that my friend from Ohio from the other side of the aisle began. She was quoting accurately an oil industry study which says that supply cannot keep up with demand, that prices are going to be high, that supply is going to be tight, and that is for the foreseeable future through the next decades.

Now, the response that we had in the Energy Policy Act of 2005 was literally to, number one, recognize that it is not possible to convert overnight; so we had incentives there for the very hard-to-get oil and gas. That is the deep, the very deep, ultra-deep, and then offshore.

Now, the offshore platforms are extraordinarily expensive. They maybe look something like this. Our friends from Louisiana would recognize many of these, and California. These units cost over $1 billion to $1.5 billion. We don't invest in them easily, but they produce a tremendous amount of energy. It is the belief of those who are concerned about the energy business, concerned about the fact that prices are high, that supply is low, they really only have two choices if prices are high and supply is tight. You can lower demand, which Americans have not seen to want to do, or you can increase supply.

So these units here, we had great incentives for those, and we felt like that would bridge us during the years to where consumers would begin to consume differently.

But I would ask our average listener, how many people do you know who actually put biodiesel in their car or their truck? How many are using any fuel other than straight gasoline? We have got some of it augmented by ethanol. But how many cars really do significantly reduce the consumption?

If the answer is not many, then you would be concerned about the time to convert. And we have had testimony in our Resources Committee where both sides of the aisle say we are probably on a 20- to 40-year conversion that you and your family probably will not drive a different car for 20 to 40 years that has a different power source than what it has got right now. So we either recognize the truth in the matter and we encourage supply while we are converting to those renewables, and the Energy Policy Act of 2005 had great stimulation. I think the difference, though, is that when we are confronted, as business-supporting conservatives, with the idea that the oil industry study says the supply is limited, it cannot keep up with demand, that we probably should increase supply.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle, and I would quote, said that we are going to reinvent our economy in the first decade of this century.

Now, it is not possible to reinvent an economy in 2½ years because we are already at year 6½. It is just not possible to reinvent an economy in 2½ years, and that becomes the great disconnect on the discussion.

I would like to spend the rest of my time talking about the energy suggestions that our current majority has. We have recently marked up H.R. 2337. We have recently passed that out of the Resources Committee. And I will tell you that we need to make one point perfectly clear, that H.R. 2337, the Rahall energy bill, which is intended to be a piece of the package that is brought to this floor, will cost Americans jobs. It will increase the cost of natural gas and gasoline. And it is going to stunt the growth of the alternative and renewable energy industry.

□ 2230

H.R. 2337 is called the Energy Policy Reform and Revitalization Act. It could be called the ''American Job Outsourcing Act,'' it could be the ''Chinese Full Employment Act,'' or it could be the ''Funding Mechanism for Hugo Chavez,'' but to declare that it is the ''Energy Industry of America Revitalization'' is intended to be a stretch of the facts.

During congressional hearings in Congress, we've heard a lot of testimony from witnesses talking about the impact of our actions on the cost of energy. So I would refer to another chart which simply talks about the cost of our energy is going to be increasing dramatically. We have received this testimony that the cost of energy probably will go up to a 23 percent increase in some areas, 29 percent on the California coast, 32 percent in the Texas region, 21 percent in the South, and in the Southeast, 19 percent; 20 percent in New York. So you see significant energy increases because of the increasing consumption of natural gas.

One witness, Paul Cicio, testified that America has lost 3 million manufacturing jobs to overseas competition due to this kind of energy increases. It is an important point because we need good jobs in America. High-tech industries and high-tech manufacturing are the future of our economy, yet they're tremendously energy dependent. You can't put a server farm in Washington or San Jose unless you have the energy to power it. You can, however, put it in Beijing because the Chinese are committed, like one of my friends said, building 544 coal-powered plants over the next 10 years to ensure they have enough cheap power. Cheap power is the key to keep their economy moving forward.

At the hearing we talked about, a couple of months ago, how Dow Chemical was going to build a $22 billion facility in Saudi Arabia because of the price of energy here in the U.S. And yet, what we're doing is restricting our access to energy here in the U.S. while we're not restricting the overseas, ensuring that we're going to import more energy, ensuring that jobs are going to continue moving to those cheap sources of energy.

American prices are simply too high, and we're doing nothing about it. And

the renewables, though they have promised, the renewables are far, far into the future, decades into the future, where they begin to affect us.

We can see that energy prices are already high and headed higher. The projections show that they're going to be 20 to 30 percent increases, which drive these billion dollar projects overseas.

I would comment that the Dow Chemical plants in both China and Saudi Arabia are going to take 10,000 jobs, those are 10,000 jobs which would be in the hundred thousand dollars range if they're here in America, and yet because of the low energy prices overseas compared to here, we're going to export those jobs. And it simply does not make sense.

Since 2000, our offshore gas production has dropped 40 percent. Our next chart will show that production decrease. It's very difficult to see, the yellow line is on the top, moves along here. And we see the energy decreasing as it moves across the chart.

We would recognize that onshore gas is actually a flat stable line, but the offshore is decreasing rapidly. And yet the Outer Continental Shelf, where we have great potential large, large resources, we're restricting access to those areas. Meanwhile, in the Rocky Mountains, where we restrict access there, those are fields which already have been drilled, so it's not as if they're pristine. We just are limiting our access to our own resources, which then compounds the problem that Ms. KAPTUR started out with initially. Prices are high, supply is tight. And we're seeing that supply gets tighter, and we're going to then increase the price.

Another thing that H.R. 2337, the Rahall energy bill, is doing is limiting shale completely. We're restricting the regulatory framework that was supposed to be out already and saying that it won't come forward. And without regulation, the industry is simply going to die. Now, that's important because in the long term, the 20 to 50 year term, shale causes America to be the Saudi Arabia of energy. If we consider just oil, Saudi Arabia has the dominant amount of energy in the world. But when we consider shale, the U.S. then becomes the dominant energy producer, and yet we're killing that industry completely.

We're in the shape that we're in today because of our decisions over the past 30 years. We chose not to build new refineries. We have chosen not to have nuclear energy. We have chosen not to drill more in this country, but instead, to restrict access on Federal lands, and so we simply have a problem of tight supplies and high prices. And those are going to continue for the foreseeable future.

Now, what does 2337 do regarding renewable energy? We hear our friends on the other side of the aisle talk about the need for renewables, but this bill begins to hurt the renewables. It begins to restrict the renewable energy development, also. It just doesn't make sense.

But we heard from four Democratic witnesses at one hearing that coal cannot be a part of America's energy future if we're to combat global warming, but according to the bill H.R. 2337, it's about the only energy source left because of restricting oil and gas in 2337. We also give deep restrictions onto the wind industry so that the Wind Energy Association came out opposed to the bill saying it cripples our industry.

The bill places new costs and restrictions on the solar industry, requiring new labor provisions, per acre fees, and purchasing restrictions. So this bill harms domestic oil and gas production, reducing domestic production, increasing our reliance on foreign oil, but it also begins to limit our development of the alternative energy sources, but even worse, the most restrictive thing for alternatives is that there were corridors that were implemented in the Energy Policy Act of 2005. Those corridors recognize that places where renewables are created are not where the population is generally. New Mexico is one of the few States that would be self-sufficient on wind, yet we can't consume all of the wind energy that we would produce there. And so there were corridors that were lined up to take the renewables from where they're produced maybe in New Mexico to Los Angeles or New York, wherever, and yet those energy corridors receive a death blow in this bill, H.R. 2337, which again is passed out on pretty well party lines and is coming to the floor of the House as a part of Ms. PELOSI's energy package. And yet you have to ask, where is the energy in the bill? Because I see where the limitations on oil and gas are; I see where the limitations on shale are; I see where the limitations on wind and solar are. Exactly where is the energy production going to come from?

I guess with the carbon sequestration that is in the bill, to the dismay of our friends on the other side of the aisle, it's going to ensure that coal is our only source of fuel for the future. But they're also trying to limit its use.

Finally, regarding royalties. This bill attempts to capture royalties owed to the American Federal Government. Like the chairman, I strongly believe that American taxpayers should receive the royalties that are due. Nevertheless, we differ when it comes to the method of collection.

I support a Royalty in Kind program where we simply declare the number of barrels produced. We can meter that, it's very easy. We don't have to calculate the price because the price changes every day. And so the take to the Federal Government changes every day if we're contemplating dollars, but Royalty in Kind is very simple, but it also puts a lot of accountants out of business, puts a lot of tax lawyers out of business. And so we could call the provisions here where we kill the Royalty in Kind program in 2337, the ''Tax Lawyer Full Employment Act.'' Because that's what it's going to do, it's going to put people in the courts saying, now exactly what was the price on November 7 of 2001 when you sold that gas? It would be so much easier just to take the meter reading, take the government's percent, and put it into the government's coffers.

In our legislative hearing on this bill, leading Members on the other side of the aisle chastised our royalty regime saying it parallels countries whose corrupt governments are blowing up the rigs. That was a quote. Then they're moving to this country to exploit our low rates. But how ironic is that? You wish for the U.S. to set an example for the world on climate change, but want to follow the lead of Venezuela and Nigeria on royalties.

I support increasing production that will bring good, safe jobs and energy to America. I support efforts to keep the ''American take'' as a portion of energy development to a reasonable level that ensures companies have the money to provide safe working conditions, keep their facilities up to date, and reinvest in development and exploration.

Finally, we had comments all through the time that the royalties received by the U.S. Government are so much lower than Russia, so much lower than Venezuela. Yet I would like to share a final chart with you that shows some of the problems.

This picture is in Russia. And I will guarantee you that you will see no oil field in America like this. The opponents on the other side of the aisle of the level of royalties that we take currently simply want to make a moral equivalency between the kind of government and regulations that allow this, and the government and regulations in this country which have produced one of the strongest energy economies in the world, which have produced the most dramatic economy of American exceptionalism in the world, and yet they're trying to unravel that and undo that.

I would hope that we all would look at the energy suggestions from our friends on the other side of the aisle, that we would carefully evaluate the fact that the supply cannot keep up with the demand, that prices are going to be high, and the supply is going to continue to be tight unless we do something about it.

I thank the gentleman for yielding tonight and appreciate the discussion on both what we've done in the past, and what we're looking for in the future according to 2337.

Mr. TERRY. Well, I thank you for your input.

I just fear that the policies that we're looking at to adopt in this Nation are going to jeopardize our security, jeopardize our future. We need to look at a balance.

I appreciate you being here, and all of the others that came to speak.

BLUE DOG COALITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor on Tuesday nights, as often the Blue Dog Coalition does. And tonight the Blue Dog Coalition wanted to come to the floor of the House of Representatives to have a discussion about energy policy in this country. I think that energy policy is an issue that is so important on so many levels, in terms of the integrity of our economy, in terms of our national security, in terms of the affordability for those who are underserved.

It touches so many different issues. And that's why I think it's important for the Blue Dog Coalition to make its voice heard, to take on this very complicated issue that has so many different components, and to try to address it in a pragmatic and practical way. Because like so many issues in Washington, this is one that's not going to be solved by those on the extreme ends of the ideological spectrum, it is going to be solved by people who want to sit down and roll up their sleeves and come up with practical solutions on how we can provide an affordable and secure energy supply for this country.

Now, I am joined by two other Blue Dogs this evening, my colleague, Mr. SCOTT from Georgia, and my colleague, Mr. MELANCON from Louisiana. We look forward to having a discussion tonight about this issue. And the Blue Dog Coalition energy principles is a document, the Blue Dog Coalition has endorsed that identifies certain principles that we think ought to be the basis of how we go about formulating energy policy in this country.

And by way of introduction, I wanted to yield as much time as he might consume right now to my colleague, Mr. SCOTT from Georgia.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Thank you very much. It is certainly a pleasure to be with both the gentleman from Louisiana, and for you as well, Mr. MELANCON.

This is definitely a major, major priority as far as the future of this country is concerned. Our energy policy is interwoven directly into our vital national security. There is no question about it.

We have, for the past 50 years, progressively gotten more and more dependent on oil from the Middle East. There is a reason why Iraq, Iran, Saudi Arabia, those Middle Eastern countries are so vital.

It is so important for us to try to hopefully find a way in which we can get peace in that region. We don't know the answer to all of this; it is largely going to be up to those Middle Eastern countries. But we are so directly tied to the future stability of that region, largely because of one thing, that is, our energy. And that has been a mistake, that we are tied to our future energy needs to the most unstable region in the world. And we now need to move very rapidly to excise ourselves from that.

The other reason why our energy policy is so vital and so important, and again, part and parcel of our national security, is because of global warming. Make no mistake about it, there may be differing opinions about global warming, there may be differing opinions about climate change, but one thing is certain, the facts do not lie. This Earth is getting warmer by the day, by the year.

Scientists have pointed out that the Earth's climate is increasing in warmth at a rate of one-tenth of a degree in each of the previous decades.

□ 2245

That may sound like a little. But when you look at just 2 degrees since the turn of the century, that is a major, major fact; the fact of dependency on oil in the Middle East, the most unstable region, the fact that we are experiencing the damage of global warming. The reason for the global warming is the excretion of carbon dioxides into the air, and that gives us the greenhouse effect.

So on those two points, we have no choice but to proceed directly ahead and provide the kind of sterling leadership this Nation deserves, as you so aptly pointed out, Mr. MATHESON, in a very responsible way, in which both sides of the aisle can come together. Everybody can come together and understand that this is not a Republican issue. This is not a Democratic issue. This is an issue for the future of the American people and the people of the world.

Mr. MELANCON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his comments. Being from an oil-producing State such as Louisiana, we have for decades been producing America's energy needs. To this day, approximately 30 percent of all the energy supply is domestically produced in our coastal areas in Louisiana. The same areas that produce all that oil and gas are also home to what we refer to as America's wetlands. The coastal marshes of south Louisiana are predominately the ones we are losing the most.

Ironically, in my district they provide roughly 30 percent of the seafood to this country. Now, people say, how can the oil industry and the seafood industry coexist side by side? Well, for a number of years, back at the beginning of time, so to speak, when the oil and gas industry began offshore drilling and wetlands drilling, there weren't the environmental standards and all the other standards that are put forth now. There wasn't the technology that is there today. So, yes, there were mistakes made.

We have learned from our mistakes. Our Government has recognized it. The States have recognized it. They have addressed those issues. If you look back after the storms, after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, if you look at the devastation that occurred across the Gulf Coast, did you hear of oil spills? The worst spills that you had actually were the gas tanks that were leaking fuel and oil on land at the oil refineries and from the service stations throughout the flooded areas.

There's a misconception. There's a fear by people that's more the fear of fear itself that people seem to concern themselves with. We have in this country, as was mentioned by some of the previous speakers in the first hour, an industry that may be misunderstood. It is called ''big oil''. But if you look who is producing the oil and gas in the United States, for the most part it is small, the independent. It may be a company such as Devon out of Oklahoma. Yes, it is on the stock market, but it was a company started in 1971 by a father and son. They took that gamble. They got out there.

It has, in fact, by the numbers I have seen, been determined that for the major oil companies to drill in the United States, whether onshore or offshore, whether deep water or shallow water, it is more expensive an investment and proposition than it is to drill in other parts of the world. Of course, there are some security problems going on in other parts of the world.

As we look at what we believe in in this country and what we should believe in in this Congress, we talk about energy independence. And energy independence, as mentioned, is not about Republicans and Democrats. It is about the old folks. It is about the young starting families. It is about the working people. It is about everybody that pumps gas in that car. It is about everybody that goes to a job.

When you look at natural gas, as Mr. PETERSON talked about, it is a clean fuel and we have ample supplies throughout this country and we ought to be producing those fuels. However, our own policies have seemed to stymie us.

The Blue Dogs have put together a package that we are proposing that is a principle, not a package, a principle that we feel we ought to be looking at and having guide us as we go through the process of developing energy legislation.

We are not going to get this country moving forward unless we encourage development of oil and gas, alternative fuels, green fuels, whatever. It all has to be part of the mix. This is not about one fuel being better than the other. This is not one fuel seeing if it can ''out politic'' another fuel. This is about trying to bring together the country to devise an energy policy, and we as the Blue Dogs felt that it was time for us to try and take the lead and to give some guidance and leadership in this matter.

With that, I turn the floor back over to my friend, Mr. MATHESON.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I think the comments from the gentleman from Louisiana are spot on in the context of we need it all. We need to look at a very diverse portfolio of energy supplies in terms of where we are today and where we want to be in the future. We want to, of course, develop as many different types of energy and diversify our portfolio, because, at the end of the day, having an affordable and secure source of energy is what makes the most sense for this country and for our economy.

While all of us would like to see a bunch of new technologies put in place immediately, the reality of this situation is it is going to take a commitment in the public policy arena and the private sector to bring a lot these technologies along.

These energy principles that the Blue Dogs have published represent a set of guidelines. I don't think the Blue Dogs come to the table saying we have all the answers. These are complicated issues that are going to require a lot of thought and a lot of work. But I do think that these principles help articulate a zone of reasonableness, if you will, within which this debate ought to take place.

Since we have kind of led into it, one of the key principles is that of fuel diversity, where the Blue Dogs think we should not be picking winners and losers, as Mr. MELANCON said. We think you have to have a diverse energy supply portfolio to have future success in this country. So we encourage any policy that is going to add to fuel diversity, that is going to add to energy infrastructure in this country.

In the long term, if we are going to have energy independence, there is no question that a whole basket of opportunities are going to help create that. It is going to include issues of conservation and energy efficiency. It is going to include new fuels. It may be cellulosic ethanol, it may be biofuels. There may be other sources that are alternative sources compared to what we use today. And it is also going to include conventional sources of energy that we have today as well.

We have to take the longer view on this, and the longer view is at some point we may have a whole different set of energy options that don't exist today. How we get from here to there is going to take a commitment to develop those technologies and a commitment to make sure we access conventional supplies we have today to keep this economy moving in the right direction so that we can all have the economic growth and opportunity that is going to allow these technologies to develop.

So, we as Blue Dogs believe in it all, whether it is oil, or gas, or biofuels, or coal, or nuclear, or hydroelectric, or geothermal, or other technologies that I may not have even mentioned. You really need to put all of that on the table, all that on the table, to give this country the opportunity to make progress and to move forward and to have a responsible, diverse energy supply.

That is one of the key principles that the Blue Dogs have tried to articulate, and I think it is one that everyone in this Congress ought to be able to get their arms around in some form and see if they can recognize the value to this country if we do that.

Mr. SCOTT, I am happy to yield to you.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. MATHESON, I would like to maybe pick up on a point you made on the diversity and alternative sources of energy. Let's just take one for a few moments and put this one on the table, because I truly believe that this is one of the major directions we are going to have to go in.

As you know, one of the problems with our dependence on oil and petroleum, aside from the Middle East and the political volatility there and the unstableness that is there, even if we had and were able to produce some of this oil on our own here, we have a refining problem. We are very short in our refining capacity.

It has been almost a quarter of a century since we even built a new refinery. There are reasons for that, environmental, people don't want them around, but they are not there. But that is another reason.

So, one of my interesting visits not long ago was to go down to South America, to Brazil, to visit Brazil. One of the reasons I wanted to go to Brazil was because I wanted to find out what they were doing and how they were doing it with their energy problem.

Here is one salient fact: Brazil and Argentina both are not dependent upon the Middle East for oil. They have moved very rapidly and are setting the curve for ethanol production.

Now, 85 percent of their automobiles are ''flex'' automobiles, in other words, running on a combination of mostly ethanol made from sugar cane.

If Brazil can do those two things, get clean energy, get ethanol, make it from a grown product that continually renews itself, and at the same time not be dependent on oil from the Middle East, surely we can learn something from what is going on in Brazil. And I did. A group of us went down to Brazil. We spent a lot of time down there. We talked to people and we found out some things there.

I believe, quite honestly, a major feature, not all of it, but a major feature of our way out and our way forward in becoming energy independent rests in the production in this country of ethanol.

Again, we have got to be very responsible as we move forward with ethanol production. We have got to have a level of moderation with it and we can't go overboard with it. It is very interesting that President Bush in his State of the Union, if you recall when he was talking about energy, mentioned it. He said we can solve our problem with ethanol made from corn, and he put some large figure out there.

But if we even just went with that, it would put such downward pressure on our food stock, on our cost of beef and poultry and chicken and pork, who feed off of corn. Corn cannot do it alone. So it has to be a dual approach with cellulosic, which is made out of pine straw and pine trees and wood chips and switch grass, which we have plenty of.

The point that I am making is we can move rapidly here, and we are. As a part of our farm bill that we will be marking up this week, that we are in the process of marking up, we and the Democrats and Blue Dogs, who make up a large part of the Agriculture Committee, are in the leadership on this, and it is one of the areas in which all of us can be very proud. But certainly within our Blue Dog Coalition, we are providing the leadership on finding a way out of our energy dependence, and we are doing it through our farm bill.

Just think, that we can grow our way out of dependence on oil in the Middle East. We have got all of it right here in this country, and I think getting the ethanol plants moving, using corn where we can, but there is a certain limit we have to have there, but use these other means of cellulosity, the wood chips, and putting the incentives in this package, as we have in the farm bill to explore and develop ethanol plants and plants of operation.

□ 2300

Also, we have to do it near the points of distribution. And in the process of creating this new industry, we create jobs when we create a clean energy source and that is one of the major steps I believe for us as we move towards energy independence.

Mr. MELANCON. I think about the technology as it was brought up a second ago. One of the concerns that we have to have here as a Congress is there is a lot of technology out there. But there is a lot of perception that there is more technology than is factually out there. What we can't do with Federal policy is put demands and time slots, et cetera, production, that far exceeds what the technology provides for.

We need to make sure that we put a bill out there that is going to be reasonable. We don't want to run off our good-paying jobs. As discussed by Mr. PETERSON earlier, natural gas is a basis for everything from fertilizer to foods to plastic, heating our homes, you name it, it is there. We need to make sure as the government, that we provide in the policy sections of these bills not only the financial support mechanism through tax breaks and other mechanisms to encourage the development of alternative fuels and to encourage the research and development of these new concepts, these new technologies, we as a government need to put that carrot out there so as to get industry to participate and to get involved in it and not discourage it.

Some of what we have seen in some of the legislation is a concern to us because it is going to be difficult to become energy independent if you are delaying the time frames for providing drilling permits to drilling companies, if you are having longer review periods for whether and when you can drill. We don't want to walk over the environmental issue. We want that to be taken under full consideration.

But right now the International Energy Agency is telling us that by the year 2030 if not sooner, this world will be short on oil and natural gas and the fossil fuels that we need to drive all of our economies worldwide. Now when you start looking at who holds the key to all the energy in the world, it is not the United States. It is in fact not the oil companies. It is the foreign countries most of whom are not necessarily our best friends.

So as a country, we need to start thinking about energy independence if we are going to stay strong. I have told people that being a strong country means when times get tough, as they did back in World War II, my parents and others, they manufactured airplanes and boats. The Higgins Crafts were made right in New Orleans. The wives went to work at the plants. The husbands went to war. And wives went to war, too, I'm being discriminatory, but everybody played a part. We were producing all of the food we needed in this country at that time and more. We were producing the energy that we needed and more. We could manufacture everything that we needed and more. And now, we as a country have come to a position where we need to import most of our energy.

According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, the United States imported 36 percent of domestically consumed crude oil and petroleum products and 4.3 percent of our natural gas supply in 1973. In 2005, we imported 66 percent of our crude oil and 16 percent of our natural gas from foreign sources. Morever, EIA projections indicate that the United States will consume 21 percent more oil and 19 percent more natural gas by 2030. Those numbers are dramatic, and that is just one country in this world who has been and should continue to be one of the strongest and mightiest and most independent countries in the world.

But what fuels the farms, is the energy that we need. What fuels the ability to get the energy, is the farms that feed the people. So it is part of a cycle. We need to make sure that if we are going to stay a strong, independent, viable country that can defend itself should it need to, then have to have an energy policy and we as Blue Dogs believe we need to provide and help guide this Congress in a way that brings us good energy policy for the long term, not for the next week, not for the next month, not to the next Congress, but for years to come.

We are drilling in areas and there are questions amongst our friends and colleagues. When you look at the gulf coast area, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas and Alabama who front on the gulf, are producing oil and gas for this country. Florida has ample supplies, but there are some restrictions off the coast, and if you come up the entire East Coast and West Coast. Now I don't fault my friends from those States not wanting to drill off their shores. But at the same time, we can't sit and talk about bringing oil and gas prices down if we are not all into this national effort. That is another issue. That is not going to be part of this bill, but that is something that CHARLIE MELANCON concerns himself with.

Mr. MATHESON. The gentleman mentioned that up to 16 percent of our natural gas is now being imported.

When we throw out the term energy, there are all different forms of energy, and it is dangerous to look at simple policy solutions when oil policy has its own implications. We know about dependence on foreign oil, but I don't think a lot of people realize we are increasing, although not yet to the same degree, but we are increasing our dependence on foreign supplies of natural gas as well. We have seen a lot of price increases over the past 5 to 7 years in the United States, and natural gas is such a key component of our economic model in this country. Those price increases can have such damaging effects on the integrity of our economy, let alone reaching each individual, particularly those on fixed incomes.

I think it is important to note, and that is the statistic that my colleague from Louisiana mentioned, we are importing natural gas into this country. I don't think a lot of people know that we are importing a lot of natural gas into this country. I want to piggyback on one other thing, short term and long term.

We have talked about how in the long run we hope technology takes us into some new places. But how do we get there. We can invest in developing those technologies, but traditional energy sources that we are using in the country today, be it oil or natural gas or coal or nuclear power, those are key components of the portfolio today. And as we move ahead in the long run and look for alternative fuels, I am sure they will provide a significant piece of that portfolio as well. But in that period before that takes place, this Congress ought to enact policies that help encourage a reliable supply of those conventional fuels that we are utilizing today. It is going to be important for our economy, it is going to be important for making process as an economy, and I think that is consistent, in fact I know that is consistent with where Blue Dog energy policy recommendations have gone.

I want to mention a second principle that is in this document, and that is the concept, because we are so concerned about maintaining energy security. We certainly don't want to go in the wrong direction. So we have taken our term PAYGO which is usually in the Congress in the context that if there is a new program that you want to spend money on, you have to find a way to pay for it. We have used that term in terms of Blue Dogs believe in energy PAYGO. That is we don't think that we should be enacting policies in this country that reduce existing domestic production. We are concerned because there are some policies out there by some of our colleagues in this Congress that we are concerned may do just that. That doesn't match up with the notion of trying to make sure that we have a secure, reliable, affordable energy supply. And the statistics that my colleague from Louisiana mentioned about the projected growth demand in the future in this country, you don't want to go backwards and be cut back on our existing domestic capabilities and in that context increasing even more so our reliance on foreign supplies.

Another critical part of the Blue Dog principles is the notion that when you find yourself in a hole, stop digging. We don't want to create a greater reliance in terms of our reliance on foreign supply. And it is not just with oils. You have to put natural gas into that discussion as well because we are importing more natural gas than we have in the past, and we have to be very careful about if we reduce our natural gas production capabilities in this country, what that means in terms of prices and putting us in an even less secure, less dependent position than we are today.

I yield to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. I think you made a significant statement there, Mr. MATHESON, that when you are in a deep hole, the first thing you do is stop digging.

I want to very, very briefly share, and I am sure there are some American people who are watching our discussion this evening, on just how serious a situation we are in. I talked about instability in the Middle East and our dependence upon oil.

Clearly there are two known facts. Right now, 42 percent of all of the known oil reserves rest under the basin in the Middle East, in Iraq, Iran, and Saudi Arabia. That is nearly half of all of the available oil supplies that we know of in the Earth. And it is not renewable. It doesn't renew itself. Eventually at some point oil is going to run out.

When I was at NATO, and we had a meeting over in Paris this past winter, our winter NATO meetings, a question was put to a noted economist, John Malone, and he made a profound statement. He said we didn't leave the stone age because we ran out of stone; nor will we leave the oil age because we have run out of oil. What he said was that civilization as we know it could very well run out before the oil runs out with the rapid rate we are going with the damage that oil-driven energy sources around the world are causing with the greenhouse effects.

I thought it would be very interesting to share with the American people just how serious this is given the fact that oil is not a renewable source of energy, given the fact that almost half of it is in a very unstable region, and much of the world is still depending upon. But according to the Energy Information Administration, here are some startling facts. They say that world daily oil consumption is projected to grow by 1.4 million barrels this year in 2007 and by 1.6 million barrels in 2008. That is daily oil consumption. You talk about running out with that rapid rate, and each year it goes up. In addition, the EIA projects a steady increase in natural gas and electric use in the United States which will create upward pressure on prices. This doesn't paint a very good picture.

And then it goes on to say that almost all scientists agree that the Earth's climate is rapidly changing and getting warmer, having increased by 2.6 degrees Fahrenheit since the turn of the century. Now as I mentioned earlier, on the surface of it, 2.6 doesn't seem like much, but it is major. The Earth's global average temperature is now approaching or possibly has passed, according to this report, the warmest experience since human civilization began over 12,000 years ago. Now it is approaching the warmest it has ever been in the history of mankind. Global warming is a fact. Climate change is a fact.

And it goes on to say that over the past 150 years, measured carbon dioxide concentrations have risen by more than one-third. The question is not whether greenhouse gases will result in climate change, but rather the magnitude, the speed, and the geographic details and the likelihood of impacts stemming from this trend.

I am not painting a gloom and doom picture here. We are talking about facts so we can get a sense, a greater sense of urgency in this Congress and in the world. So many places over in the world we are fighting and killing one another over what could very well be in the scheme of things very trivial. We are all in the same bucket as human beings.

□ 2315

This earth of ours is precious, and for no other reason more important than saving this earth for our future generations, the air we breathe all rests in the decisions that we make in this Congress today.

I know and I share the same feeling with you all that we feel very honored and very privileged to be elected and serving in Congress at a time when this is our challenge. And when they write the history books and perhaps our grandchildren and children will look and say, well, what did grand-daddy or my daddy do at that time, the history books will reflect very proudly that we provided the leadership at a very crucial time to move this Nation forward in getting away from oil dependency and getting into clean energies.

We have the means to do it. We know we need to do it, and we have the direction to do it.

Mr. MELANCON. I'd like to expound on what Mr. SCOTT just had to say. I've talked about that since the storms that devastated south Louisiana. I've seen the marshes of south Louisiana that I grew up hunting and fishing in, where my son and I have spent many, many weekends and weekdays and just out there enjoying the land and the water. And I've got a new grandson, and of course, after these storms, seeing the damage to these wetlands, these estuaries, seeing and hearing the facts that I'm hearing on climate change and the concern with, as I tell people, there will always be a planet called earth. The question is will there be an earth with life or with quality of life.

And we are in the generation, we are in a time in this Congress where I believe, as you, we have an opportunity to do it, but we have to do it right because I don't think we're going to get multiple chances at it. We've got to try and make those decisions as wisely as we can so that, whatever it is that we do, it is for the next generation and those that succeed them.

Hopefully, when they read the history books, the three of us and the other Blue Dogs and the other Members of this Congress, both Republican and Democrat, will go down well in history as saying they had the foresight.

Think about the people that put together and wrote the Constitution of the United States, and look at how we've lived with that Constitution for well over 200 years, and you think about it. It should be possible that people of our times and our capabilities can come together and work and come up with a policy that gets this country, gets this world and makes it work for us so that we can all live in harmony and peace.

And one of the things that I can remember a number of years back in one of the presidential elections, one of the presidential candidates went to the grocery store and didn't know what the checkout scanner was. Well, you know, there are kids in this world, I hope there's no Members of Congress that still believe that milk comes from the dairy department at the grocery store and not from the cow on the farm.

And the same with gas from the gas pump. There's many people out there that don't realize that you have to go and drill for oil in order to put that gasoline in that automobile to run those kids to baseball or basketball or cheerleading or whatever.

And so we need to understand what it is that drives the country. It is not a mechanical pump at the convenience store at the corner. It is an industry that needs to have a return on investment, and it is the government that needs to set policy that makes it so that the industry wants to produce it and produce it in volumes.

Yes, we have not done what we should be doing to encourage investment not only in the refining capacity. We're starting to see that. We did some of that about 2 years ago. There is some on-line. In my district alone, there's at least two refineries that are expanding. One of them will be a huge expansion project.

And the problem that I've always said is it's not that we can't produce the oil and gas or buy it from some other country, but you still have to have the capability of processing it through. But you still have, because you are not producing it fast enough in this country, dependence upon foreign oil coming in.

Ironically, this past week, speaking of climate change, there was a scientist that decided to swim in the Arctic Ocean and dove in and swam 6/10ths of a mile in 29-degree water in the Arctic Ocean. The symbolism there was we have a problem. He is the first man in history to swim for any length in the Arctic Ocean in a swimming suit. He might need other testing, but at the same time I think he's proved his point to me.

For those people that don't think that there's such a thing as global warming and/or climate change, the scientific community has documented it. It's there. We've talked about it. You don't have to believe everything that's said by a Member of Congress. Sometimes I doubt some of the things I hear, but the things that I see, the horrific hurricanes, the tornado activity throughout the country in areas that have never been affected, the floods that are occurring consistently, the droughts that are occurring throughout the United States, some people say, well, you just know more about them because the news is there. No, they're there. They're being documented. They are more frequent, more severe than we've ever seen.

So we need to move fast. We need to move together. We need to come together as a country, as a Congress, and put together policy that our kids and our grandkids and the future generations will have hope that the world will be as good as it was for us.

Mr. MATHESON. Well, I thank my colleague and I want to follow up with two more of the principles. There are eight in total by the way. We've already talked about a couple.

But one of the Blue Dog energy principles does have to do with climate change, and my two colleagues really have described mostly the thinking behind these principles, but to put in summary, the Blue Dog principles say, look, there's broad scientific consensus that climate change is happening.

Blue Dogs also believe it's taken place over a significant period of time. We need to make sure we get this right with a methodical approach, and it may very well be a long-term approach to try to change the direction we're going, but we want to make sure we get it right. There are some folks who want to act very quickly and in a radical way, and that may not be the best solution.

We also wanted to make sure we had a global approach. If we simply enact policies in this country, we may be exporting jobs and pollution overseas, and that doesn't get us to where we need to be because this is a global issue. So the Blue Dogs want to have an approach that tries to encourage global participation, an approach that does not disproportionately affect one industry or one sector. It needs to be an economy-wide approach in how we look at this issue and how we try to reduce our carbon footprint in affecting the climate change issue.

So I think the Blue Dogs have laid out a framework that makes a lot of sense. Again, as I said before, we don't claim to have the answer to every single aspect of this issue. We think we've established a framework that makes a lot of sense for people making good, sound decisions.

A second principle, and it really follows up on what my colleague from Louisiana said a little earlier, he was talking about how people sometimes don't know what it takes to get energy to the point where you use it. People just pull the pump at the gas station. They don't have any real appreciation for the complex process it takes to get it to that point. And that applies to all forms of energy.

I think people take for granted when they flip a switch and the light goes on, that the light just goes on, and they don't have a full appreciation for what it takes to generate that electricity and get it delivered to that building or that house where the light switch exists.

And so another one of the Blue Dog energy principles recognizes we need to invest in the energy infrastructure in this country. It doesn't just happen without investment. It costs money, and whether it's a refinery expansion or whether it's an ethanol plant that my colleague from Georgia was talking about that we want to develop in this country or whether it's finding renewable sources, let's say, wind energy that makes electricity, that costs money. It doesn't happen without that type of investment.

It's going to take significant commitment from both the public and private sector in this country to ensure we have an energy infrastructure that can deliver reliable sources of supply and affordable sources of supply.

So we need to look for those. Again, the Congress we need to look for those public policy options, public policy decisions that create the environment for that to happen. It's not going to be done all by the government, nor should it be by the way. We want the marketplace to evolve and pursue the most efficient technologies and efficient delivery systems, the most efficient ways to make this happen, but we can help set the table, if you will, to make sure we have the right incentives in our economic model to encourage that to happen.

So that's another one of the Blue Dog energy principles that I think is very important, and we specifically point out within the electorate sector that we need to make sure we have investment in the transmission grid, investment in making sure it's efficient distributed generation.

During the previous hour, one of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle had their Special Order here just before us. I think one of my colleagues mentioned the notion that you may have a significant wind resource where you can put up a number of windmills, but it's going to go be in a remote area, and you have got to get that product, that electricity created by those wind turbines, from that remote area to where the load factor is, and that's going to be let's say in urban area that may be hundreds of miles away, and you have got to invest in a transmission system that allows that to happen.

So, as I said at the start of my comments at the start of this hour, it's a complicated issue. You can mention with energy and everyone kind of nods their head, but if you really start looking at all the sub-issues below that, there are a lot of issues out there. And the Blue Dogs are trying to articulate a pragmatic, practical approach to try to capture all those issues and have a good discussion with Members of both parties and try to create those good public policy decisions to help us get to where we want to be as a country.

So I wanted to again follow up on those two comments that my colleague from Louisiana mentioned, and with that I'm happy to turn over time again to Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Thank you very much. I think in addition to the plans and the points that we have offered here, there's the other side of this that we have got to face, and that is human behavior. We've got to provide leadership to change human behavior when it comes basically to the one instrument that is causing so much of the pollution, that is causing the earth to get warmer. That is the automobile, and we have to move on both fronts. We have to move on the front of getting the American people to do, and we can do this if we use our policy right, if we use our incentives right.

One is that we need to provide encouragement and incentives for individuals to get out of their automobiles, to use other means of transportation, especially in our large urban areas.

Let me tell you about my region of the country that I represent which is Atlanta. The Atlanta area has one of the highest carbon dioxide emissions area in this country, and with that is traffic congestion, which is about to choke the great promise of our city, not only in our region, not only in terms of the traffic but the air we breathe.

So we have got to move and provide the leadership to get alternative means of transportation moving people from place to place without such great dependency on the automobile. Just think about the time and productivity and hours that's a waste in the human productivity of sitting in traffic jams, let alone the waste of energy and the idling of the motors just in the traffic jams alone. We can't continue that way. We've got to do things.

Commuter rail is one of the areas that we are working. That's hard. It's hard to get people out of their automobiles, but it might be good policy for us to move to an area of good Federal tax dollars being used as incentives to be able to give people opportunities to get on these commuter rails. Perhaps we ride for free. Perhaps they're down in a subsidized cost. We've got to do something.

In Europe and in France and throughout Europe and in Japan, they have got trains now that are zipping people along at 100. They have got one over in Asia and Japan somewhere that's going about 150, 160 miles an hour. Where would we be without the rapid commuter rail systems we have in the northeast? Can you imagine if we didn't have it? You think traffic is bad between New York, Boston and Washington, D.C. Just think it what it would be like if we didn't have those systems.

So there are ways in which we've got to do that.

□ 2330

The other thing is; and I am not saying, I know how hard it is, I love my car. We are a society in a culture in America that has just grown up with the automobile. It's a part of us from the drive-ins to all the things that we associate with the good life. Get a home, get a car. You are in America.

But maybe, in addition to getting them out of those cars with incentives and the commuter rail and other means, maybe we can do something with the car itself. They are doing some things, American ingenuity is already at work in New York. The Ford Motor Company is now putting together an electric car. They are already out there. We have moved, and I think we are moving with the proposal in this Congress, to give an incentive, to give a tax write-off, tax benefit, some help, for people who will buy cars that run on the batteries and electricity. They have this.

I think there is a lot more we can do, in changing the habits of the American people, changing to get them out of the automobiles, and then changing the nature of the automobiles themselves, and then, of course, getting the clean sort of renewable energy we can to put them in. These are the kinds of proposals and approaches that I think this issue calls for, and I think it's the way forward in the future.

Mr. MELANCON. I think about Americans, myself as an American, and how spoiled we are with just being able to get in our car and go where we want, when we want. I like to tell people, and it's not that I should be bragging on it, because I'm not, but I think I'm probably a typical American family man. I

have got a Suburban and a Tahoe, I mean, that's not good, but I have got a boat. My son has a boat. We like to hunt, and we like to fish.

We have lifestyles that we have been fortunate enough that we can live. But now we're coming to a point in time where instead of maybe having a Suburban and a Tahoe, I could do with just having one and have a more efficient vehicle that got better mileage.

Part of what we are talking about in the energy efficiency system CAFE limits. Now, you can get to the limits drastically, as Mr. MATHESON expressed, by just saying, by year 2015 or 2018, you have got to reach a certain limit for automobiles and trucks, and, you know, just damn everybody else, doesn't matter about the jobs, let's just get there.

Or you can take it as a curve that takes you to that point, maybe not as acutely as a straight line, and says that you got to get there by 2022, and you have got to achieve some goals on the way up there, that doesn't provide that we lose the manufacturing jobs and the manufacturers. I mean, after World War II, there were 33 vehicle types in America, our labels, as they call it. There are 335 now, different vehicle labels out there in the United States.

We are spoiled, and we still want to have those luxuries and be able to live those lives, the lifestyle. But we all have to start, first of all, all of us, are going to have to start pinching ourselves and come to the realization that we are going to have to make some changes in our lifestyles if we want to keep this world and this country vibrant in more ways than just fuel economy.

So the CAFE limits, we are going to have to choose, choose something that works, choose something that is not drastic, so that America can make that transition, so that America doesn't have to just drop everything and start all over again.

When we talked about infrastructure, we need to provide incentives so that you see some of the problems you have with providing electricity. In the northeast, you saw a lot of it over the last several years. Some of our transmission capacities and the grids Mr. MATHESON talked about. Yes, it's great to go produce solar power or wind energy, but you have still got to get it somewhere.

If you are going to do ethanol, they are saying there is a problem with putting it in the pipeline, so you will have to build special pipelines just for ethanol. But somebody has got to have incentive to go build those pipelines.

We talk about having fuel-efficient cars. They are all over the place, flex fuel. You can walk out of here. There are thousands and thousands and thousands of them. But you can't find a station to find E–85. It's not available.

So to do one thing that sounds good, it's part of a whole package, and that's what the Blue Dogs are trying to make sure that we keep focused. There was a guy that I knew once, he says, just remember, keep your eye on the ball, and the ball here is getting America moved forward, but getting America's energy policy done right.

That's what we have got to stay focused on as a country, as a Congress, and this administration, to help us make sure that we provide good, sound energy policy.

Mr. MATHESON. I think there are two broad issues out here. Our hour is drawing to a close, but there are two broad issues out here in the energy debate. One is energy independence and security, and the other is climate change challenge.

Now those issues are not mutually exclusive. In fact, a number of the provisions to pursue each of those issues are complementary, and we should look at it in that context. But I do think that the Blue Dogs have come up with a set of principles, we haven't been able to talk about every one of them tonight, and we will come back again on the floor to do that.

As I said, this is a complicated issue. There are a lot of layers to this issue, and this Congress needs to first recognize that level of complexity to make sure we make good decisions. You have to recognize the magnitude of the issue before you can make good decisions.

But I do want to touch on just one other area that is a principle the Blue Dogs feel is very important, and that's the notion that we need to have an aggressive effort at technology development. We talked a little bit about technology development tonight, but let's put it in perspective to where if we really want to get to a point where we have greater energy independence, and if we make progress on the carbon emission issue as well.

The technologies aren't there today that need to be there. First of all, is the technology called carbon capture and sequestration. More than half of all the electricity we make in this country is coal. You know what, this country has a lot of coal. In fact, one-fourth of the world's coal is right here in the United States. It's cheap, it's plentiful.

The way we burn it now we put CO_2 in the atmosphere. The hope is that we can develop the technology to capture that carbon and sequester it. But that technology isn't there yet today.

So, when Blue Dogs talk about we need to make a significant and aggressive commitment to technology development, that's one of the technologies. It's real straightforward. We will have coal as part of our energy mix. I think most people think that in terms for the long run in terms of our electric production. But we have got to solve that carbon issue, and we have got to invest in technology.

Second, we have had discussions about cellulosic ethanol. We can't rely on corn as our source of ethanol in this country. There has to be a better way to do it. We have got to move technology in that direction. A third one, just to throw an example, battery technology. We want to get to the point where we have the car you can go home and plug in at night and run on electricity. A lot of people have spent a lot of time and money trying to develop that battery technology. We are still not there yet.

That's an appropriate Federal role to invest and move ahead with that research and development. I just want to make sure, that's the other principle I get out tonight that the Blue Dogs believe in, that that's the right role for the Federal Government to do, to push the development of these technologies.

One of the greatest American strengths is innovation. That's what this country is all about. It's why we are a superpower. We have got to unleash that again and again. The government can't drive all that, but we can sure encourage it. That is what we ought to do.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. The one area we did not mention, because we need to, because it's going to play a very important role in the future, that's nuclear, nuclear energy. I know when you mention the words nuclear energy, folks get a little shaky, but that's an education job, that's a leadership job. But nuclear energy is reliable, it's low cost, everywhere we have the safety necessary, there's a licensing process that we go through, there are all kinds of features there. But nuclear energy is very, very important, it's going to play a very important role, and we have got to invest in it.

Finally, I have got to say, I think in reminding a great historian once said, on the bleached bones of many past civilizations are written those pathetic words, too late. Let us hope and let us know for sure with the action we are taking in this Congress that they will not be able to say that about our civilization on this energy and global warming. We are not going to move too late.

Mr. MELANCON. I agree with that, and in one closing remark, just a thought, as people in public life, you have times where constituents are there wanting things, and, of course, as there is the old expression, what have you done for me today? I hope when this energy policy debate is over, and we have come to a consensus and passed a bill, that it's a good bill, and that we can say to you, I worked to secure your energy future, and I hope that it's going to be one that carries you for generations.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Well stated.

Mr. MATHESON. I want to thank both of my colleagues for joining us. As I said, the Blue Dog coalition stands ready to work with people on both sides of the aisle. We approach these issues through a very, practical, pragmatic way. We want to do what's right for this country.

We are going to come back and talk about energy more and more. By the way, I think this is one of the great domestic policy issues. By that way,

that's foreign policy implications, as my colleague pointed out in his comments earlier. It's one of the great issues we face as a country, and it's helpful to help drive forward that debate.

HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for the time remaining before midnight.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I do have a lot of material to cover in the time that is available.

I thought it was appropriate, as we end this legislative day here in the United States House of Representatives, that we talk a little bit about health care, because health care will be one of the central arguments, one of the central themes that consumes this country over the next 16 months as we lead up to the presidential election. Indeed, you are already hearing presidential candidates talk about their various visions for health care.

One of the things that concerns me greatly is the issue of the issue of the state of our physician workforce. In my home State of Texas, the Texas Medical Association puts out a periodical every month. In March the title of the magazine they put out was ''Running out of Doctors,'' a great concern of mine.

A year and a half ago Alan Greenspan came and talked to a group of us right before he left as Chairman of the Federal Reserve board. And someone asked him about Medicare and about how we are going to pay for Medicare in the future. He acknowledged that it was going to be difficult, but at the appropriate time he felt that Congress would be able to step up to the job of doing what was going to be necessary to pay for Medicare. He paused, and he said, well, what concerns me greatly is will there be anyone there to provide the services that you need?

That's what I would like to address this evening. I think if I could, I am going to confine my remarks to the limited time I have to four areas. I want to talk a little bit about medical liability, I want to talk a little bit about the status of the physician workforce in regards to the developing physician, the person who may be in college or high school considering a career in health care, I want to talk about the physician in training, and I want to concentrate greatly on what I call the mature physician, the physician who is in practice, and some of the effects of current governmental policy where we reduce payments to physicians year over year and the pernicious effect that is having on the physician workforce.

First, just touching on liable, my home State of Texas had a significant problem with he had some call liability. In 2003, the State legislature passed a medical liability reform based off of a prior California law, the Medical Injury Compensation Reform Act of 1975, which was passed by California, but we updated it for the 21st Century.

Indeed, the law passed by the Texas Legislature in 2003, was based off the California law, that had as its basis caps on noneconomic damages, but in California, that was a fixed $250,000 cap for all noneconomic damages. As you can see from the visual aid, Texas trifurcated the cap. We have a $250,000 cap on physicians for noneconomic damages, $250,000 cap on a hospital for noneconomic damages and a $250,000 cap on a second hospital or nursing home, if one has been involved.

□ 2345

Well, this was passed back in 2003. How has the Texas plan fared? The year I first ran for Congress, 2002, we had dropped from 17 insurers down to two. It was almost impossible to get medical liability insurance at any price because of the effects of the legislation passed. There are now 14 insurers back in the State, and most of those have come back in without an increase in premiums.

Three years after passage, the Medical Protective Company had a 10 percent rate cut which was their fourth since April of 2005. Texas Medical Liability Trust, my last insurer of record, declared an aggregate cut over the past 4 years of 22 percent. Another company called Advocate MD filed a 19.9 percent rate decrease. And another company called Doctors Company announced a 13 percent rate cut, real numbers that affect real people and affect real access to care.

Probably one of the most significant unintended beneficiaries of this legislation that was passed in 2003 in my home State of Texas was the smaller not-for-profit community hospitals. These were hospitals that were self-insured and had to put large amounts of cash up as a cash reserve against a potential lawsuit. What has happened since this law has past is these hospitals have found they have been able to take more of that cash and invest it in capital, invest it in nurses' salaries, exactly the kinds of things you want your smaller, not-for-profit community hospital to be doing in your community.

Mr. Speaker, I took the language of the Texas plan and modified it so it would work within the constructs of our language here in the House of Representatives and actually offered this language to the ranking member of our House Budget Committee, who had the bill scored by the Congressional Budget Office. And the Texas plan, as applied to the House of Representatives to the entire 50 States, would have yielded a $3.8 billion savings over 5 years. Now, not a mammoth amount of money in Congress speak; but when you talk about a $2.99999 trillion budget, any savings that you could manage is in fact significant. And this is money that could have gone for a pay-for for many of the other things that we talk about doing for health care in this body.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of people ask me: Well, if Texas has solved the problem, so why are we even concerned about it on the national level? One is the savings that was demonstrated by the Congressional Budget Office. Another is this, Mr. Speaker: consider the cost of defensive medicine.

A 1996 study, 11 years ago, done by Stanford University revealed that in the Medicare system alone, just Medicare, not Medicaid, not the Federal prison system, but in the Medicare system alone the cost of defensive medicine was approximately $28 billion to $30 billion a year. Ten or 11 years ago it was at that expense, and I submit that that number is significantly higher today if anyone would rework those numbers.

Another consideration is young people getting out of school. They look at the cost of professional liability insurance and say, you know what, I am going to stay out of those higher risk specialties because it is just not worth it to me.

Now, I do want to draw my colleagues' attention to a bill, H.R. 2583. This bill addresses graduate medical education. It is an enhancement for graduate medical education, and would develop a program that would permit hospitals, hospitals that do not traditionally operate a residency program, the opportunity to start a residency program to help again build physician the workforce of the future. On average, it costs $100,000 a year to train a resident, and that cost for a smaller hospital can actually be an impossible barrier to entry. But because of this bill, that would create a loan fund available to hospitals to create residency programs where none has operated in the past; and it would require full accreditation and be generally focused in rural suburban or inner urban communities.

Another bill that I would direct my colleagues' attention to, H.R. 2584, this bill is designed to help medical students and those who have just recently graduated from medical school with a mix of scholarship, loan repayment funds, tax incentives to entice more students into medical school and create incentives for those students and newly minted doctors. The program will have an established repayment plan for students who agree to go into family practice, internal medicine, emergency medicine, general surgery, OB/GYN, and practice in an underserved area. It is a 5-year authorization. It is fairly modest at $5 million a year and would provide additional educational scholarships in exchange for a commitment to serve in a public or private nonprofit health facility determined to have a critical shortage of primary care physicians.

Mr. Speaker, in whatever time I have left, I do want to address again the group that I call the ''mature physician,'' and I want to address that from the perspective of the formula that is called the ''sustainable growth rate

formula.'' That is the formula under which Medicare reimburses physicians.

Why is that important? Let me show you this. If we look at how Medicare pays for the administration of care in this country, we have a situation where doctors are paid under a different formula from hospitals, from insurance plans, from drug companies, from nursing homes.

And look at this graph, Mr. Speaker. What you see is that physicians receive cuts year over year, unless Congress steps in at the last minute and does something, which we did for several years here right after I first got to Congress. But compare that with Medicare advantaged hospitals and nursing homes where every year there is a cost-of-living update, the Medicare economic index, if you will, that adjusts payments upward. But year over year there is a reduction in reimbursement, and the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services for Physicians provides this cut for physicians who take care of the patients.

It is not a question of doctors wanting to make more money; it is about a stabilized repayment system for services that have already been rendered. And it is not just affecting doctors; it affects patients. Not a week goes by that I don't get a letter or a fax from some doctor, usually in my home State of Texas, oftentimes in my district but sometimes it is someplace far afield. But they say, You know what? I have just had enough of what Medicare is doing to my reimbursement schedule and I am going to retire early. I am no longer going to see Medicare patients in my practice, or I am going to restrict the procedures that I offer to Medicare patients.

In fact, I had a young woman come up to me that I trained with at Parkland Hospital and tell me what Medicare was doing to her wasn't right and, as a consequence, she was not going to be offering a certain set of high-risk procedures to her patients any longer.

And the question is, where will those patients go for that treatment? I saw it in the hospital environment before I left practice to come to Congress and, again, I hear it in virtually every town hall that I hold back in my district. Someone will come up to me, either as a question in the formal part of the meeting or afterwards, and say, how come in this country you turn 65 and you have got to change doctors? And the answer is, because the doctor they were seeing found it no longer economically viable to continue to see Medicare patients because this was happening to them, and year over year they weren't able to pay the cost of delivering the care, never mind taking a paycheck home to support their family.

Medicare payments to physicians are modified annually under this SGR formula. The process is flawed, it needs to be repealed, because it mandates physician fee cuts that have gone on in recent years be continued indefinitely, and they become quite substantial over time.

Now, the quandary that you always hear quoted is that simple repeal of the SGR is cost prohibitive. But we could, Mr. Speaker, consider doing that over time. We could consider setting a date in the future by which the SGR would be repealed and perhaps bring that cost down to an attainable level.

The bill that I have recently introduced, H.R. 2585, would repeal the SGR in 2010. Now, in the new physician payment stabilization bill, 2 years from now the SGR formula goes away. But there are incentives provided to physicians in the year 2008 and the year 2009 based on some quality reporting and technology improvements.

More importantly, by resetting the baseline of the SGR formula, the CBO estimates that the practical effect of my bill would bring a 1.5 percent update in 2008 and a 1 percent update in 2009, and a complete elimination of the SGR by 2010. The CBO score calculates a savings of $40 billion off the total price tag of an SGR elimination.

Again, there are also in addition to essentially what is a Medicare economic index update for 2008, a little less than that for 2009, and then elimination of the formula and a full MEI update starting in 2010, which would be a significant change from where we are now. In addition to that, bonus payments for physicians who are willing to voluntarily do some quality reporting and bonus payments for physicians who are willing to voluntarily participate in some health information technology upgrades, computerization of their practice, if you will.

One of the main thrusts of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to require the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services to look up, to ascertain the top 10 conditions that drive the highest percentage of payments, and then require CMS to adopt reporting measures relating to those conditions. In fact, those have already been developed. We are not going to reinvent the wheel here. The American Medical Association Physician Consortium has already developed those reporting measures that are driving spending so high.

Mr. Speaker, the old bank robber Willie Sutton, when he was asked, Why do you rob the bank? He said, Because that's where the money is. Mr. Speaker, let's go where the money is. Let's go to those top 10 things where the greatest amount of money is spent, those top 10 diagnostic codes or top 10 diseases where the major amount of money is spent in Medicare, and it amounts to about 70 percent of the savings in Medicare, because that is where the greatest amount of savings is going to occur.

If we can deliver more care in a timely fashion and we can improve outcomes, you are actually going to spend less. And, again, that is the thrust of this bill. That is why you postpone the repeal of the SGR by 2 years, to get that savings that is going to happen by doing things better, quicker, smarter, the same types of things we saw when we began to provide a prescription drug benefit under the part D part of Medicare. Those costs that were originally projected by CBO and the Office of the Management of the Budget of the White House, actually, those scores were way too high.

The actual figures for the first year of the operation of the Medicare prescription drug program came in lower. Why did it come in lower? Partly because of competition and partly because the cost-effective thing also turns out to be the right thing to do oftentimes in the practice of medicine. A lot of savings are in fact available in this system if we only again have the courage to do that.

Let me just speak briefly about health information technology, because it does receive a lot of attention. Here in the House of Representatives we worked on several bills last year. We will probably have an opportunity to have several bills this year. Indeed, a reform in health information technology is part of the bill that I introduced, H.R. 2585, to repeal the sustainable growth rate formula.

But let me just point out a couple of things. I don't know that I was a big believer in electronic medical records when I left the practice of medicine and came to Congress. They are expensive, a big cost for a small practice to set it up. They slow you down. When you are in practice, it adds minutes to each patient; and if you are seeing 30 patients a day and you add 2 minutes to each patient, that is an extra hour. How are you going to be compensated for that extra hour that you spend?

Mr. Speaker, this is a picture of the medical records room at Charity Hospital in New Orleans. It was taken in January of 2006, 5 months after Hurricane Katrina hit there. And this had been completely under water, of course, when the city was flooded. When the Corps of Engineers got the water out, this is what was left. And you see a typical medical records room with all of these paper charts. But this black discoloration is not from smoke or soot; that is black mold that has grown on these charts. It is not safe to let anyone go in there and try to retrieve data from those charts because of what has happened with the mold contamination.

All of those records are lost, tens of thousands of patients. A patient who might have been waiting for a bone marrow transplant or a kidney transplant, a patient who is in the middle of their cancer therapy, All of that was lost in those records.

Mr. Speaker, in January of this year we heard a lot of stories about Walter Reed Hospital, and I went out to Walter Reed to look for myself about what was happening with the treatment of our soldiers who are on medical hold. And Sergeant Blades took me around the complex and showed me the things that had been in all of the newspapers.

And then he said, You know what bugs me even more than anything else. I could live with all of the other stuff, but here is the real problem I have. He was trying to assemble his medical records so he could make his case to the VA about a disability claim he had.

He had been in the service for a number of years, he had suffered some injuries during his time in the service, and he wanted to be able to make his case for disability payments. He said he will spend probably 20 to 24 man hours on his medical records making the case, going through it with a yellow highlighter. And then he said, It goes and sits on someone's desk for 2 week's time and then it is lost. And the reason for that is there is not an electronic medical records system that the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense can communicate with each other. So he has to go back and reconstruct the paper trail of his 20 years in the service and document all of the problems that he has had with his injuries over time in order to make his case for a disability claim.

And that is what was concerning him more than anything else that day, was that it took so much time to get these things assembled and he was at the mercy of someone misplacing that record off their desk, and he would have to go back to square one. His medical hold would be either extended or denied, and he would have to start all over again with assembling his medical record. He advised his men to make two or three copies of their medical records before they submitted it to the appropriate person in the infirmary.

Mr. Speaker, I know our time is about up. I appreciate the indulgence of the time this evening. Again, health care is an important topic. We are going to spend a lot of time on it in the weeks and months to come. And, again, it will be part of the central theme of Presidential elections on both sides of the political spectrum. And to be sure, I will be back here on several occasions talking about some of the things that I think are most important. But when you look at the problem with losing physicians, when you look at the problem with how we treat our Medicare physicians, the problems they have in getting their payment rates straightened out, what happens if you don't take care of that? You lose doctors. Patients don't have the physicians to see.

What will Congress do in that event? I don't know. Parliament over in Great Britain decided it was in their best interest to bring physicians in from overseas on visas and give them waivers. Someone else paid for their education and they worked cheap. But we also saw in Scotland over the 4th of July weekend, that didn't turn out to be a good idea.

HEALTH CARE

Introduction

This evening I will address my concerns about the delivery of health care services in this country. The future of medical care in this country will be hotly debated in Congress and especially over the next 18 months as we approach the 2008 Presidential elections and the 111th Congress that convenes in 2009.

We will be deciding the avenue through which our system will be based—on the table exists two choices. First is to expand the government or public sector's involvement in the delivery of services—popularly referred to as ''universal health care'' or termed in the early 90s as ''Hillary Care.'' Or second, whether we encourage and continue the private sector involvement in the delivery of health care. These two options bring about a plethora of questions and concerns, and I am hopeful that my explanations tonight will shed light on the direction we should be taking to have the United States remain as the best health care system in the world.

Now some people may feel that is an overstatement. They will cite uninsured numbers of the cost of prescription drugs. But while these issues abound, they are statistics and the old adage remains, ''there is truth, there are lies, and then there are statistics.'' You can make the numbers say whatever you like or the outcome of polls can be manipulated just by massaging how you ask the question. So I will dispense with these avenues and simply explain the situation at hand and the solutions currently available.

I'll be discussing different principles guiding the debate about private versus public delivery of health care services, but let me give you a background on how we got to the system we have today. The idea that we must solve this problem is not new. Secretary Leavitt has even remarked the necessity tackling the decision between these two philosophies. As he said in an op-ed recently, ''Should the government own the system or should we organize the system.''

History

Coming out of World War II, the United States had a flourishing economy and an upsurge in the birthrate clearly coining the phrase ''Baby Boom'' generation. The U.S., unlike many of our allies coming out of the war was able to benefit from the economic prosperity by developing a hybrid system for the delivery of health care including both a public and private involvement. Europe, in contrast, was suffering from depleted resources and fatigue after World War II. It was clear from the outset that their economies, in particular that of Great Britain, were unable, from the private sector, to uphold the delivery of health care. The government had to run the health care system.

Next we fast forward roughly 20 years to the mid-60s and the Presidency of Lyndon Baines Johnson, a fellow Texan from across the aisle. During his tenure, both Medicare and Medicaid programs were signed into law. These large, government-run programs were created to focus on hospital care for the elderly and basic health care services for the poverty-stricken respectively.

Decades later, it was evident that the government-run Medicare program was slow to change, a behemoth to operate and extraordinarily expensive. By 2003, Congress recognized that the outdated model of providing largely hospital-only care to the elderly was insufficient. The government system needed to catch-up to the robust private system that was already focused on prevention and disease management. Finally, Congress passed the Medicare Prescription Drug Plan that gave seniors coverage for the medications. While the program has been successful, and has provided greater benefits for seniors, it did not come without considerable discussions and a massive push by the success of the private sector. And here is our crossroads today.

Currently the government pays for nearly half of all health care administered in this country. With a current GDP of roughly $11 trillion, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services states that Medicare and Medicaid Services alone cost $600 billion. The other half of health care is broken down with primary weight being carried by the private industry, and charitable and self-pay accounting for the rest.

As these numbers increase, and the Federal Government continues to funnel the American taxpayer's dollars into its coffers, we must ask if this is the best use of taxpayer dollars? Is the government doing an excellent job of managing your money? Do you think the government is better suited to care for your health care needs? Who is better to handle the growing health care crisis in this country?

I argue that the government-only, or universal health care system, is unsustainable in America and will hamper our innovation and delivery of the most modern health care services available.

I can site two specific examples that support my premise that a private-based system is better equipped, more flexible, and less expensive (being driven by the market) than a government-based system. First we can look to our northern border at Canada. Canada boasts a universal health care system but what it fails to highlight is the tremendous wait list for treatment that patients must endure. Their access to care is limited. Now this is not a significant problem if you are a wealthy Canadian because you can take your money, cross the southern border in the U.S. and receive care immediately. If you were waiting for bypass surgery, would you prefer to get into the hospital as quickly as possible or be placed on a waiting list that could take months? Is your health, or the health of your loved ones something that you can take a gamble with?

My second example stems from the British Isles where they suffer so of the same fate. The British National Health Service is a 2-tier system that faces continued allegations of ageism. The system can simply no longer treat patients over 80 because the system recognizes that the patients at this age will simply not survive their wait time. It is a sad reality, but it is true.

So I return to my premise that the private sector is more nimble and financially a more stable arena from which to build our future health care system. Noting this complex relationship, how should Congress do its job to ensure we have the best health care system possible? Congress must promote policies that keep the private sector leading the way with some interaction by the well-run government programs.

Uninsured

One issue that springs to mind concerns the uninsured population, which the U.S. Census Bureau estimated at some 46 million back in 2005. Now I want to be specific . . . access to health care is not the issue. Those individuals classified as ''uninsured'' means they are not covered by a specific plan; it does not

mean they cannot seek health care services. In fact, no one is denied health care services in this country. Two specific examples of where access is available through the State Children's Health Insurance Program and Federally Qualified Health Centers.

SCHIP

In 1997, the Republicans introduced a new program designed to help provide medical coverage to every vulnerable child. The program, commonly referred to as SCHIP, operates a joint Federal-State partnership. It provides flexibility for States to determine standards for providing health care funding for those children who are not eligible for Medicaid but whose parents cannot truly afford health care insurance. The program has been very successful across the board.

As SCHIP is being reauthorized this year and heavily debated on both sides of the Capitol, I continue to push for clarification on two issues. First, the intent of SCHIP is clear—the acronym said CHILDREN. However, some States have opted to spend funds on others instead of children. To stop this process, I introduced H.R. 1013, making certain that SCHIP funds are spent exclusively on children and pregnant women—not on any other group.

Second, it is imperative, as we move forward in this debate, that individuals have the flexibility to use SCHIP funds to procure health care coverage that works best for them. Some legislation I've seen would carve people out of the private insurance market; this was never the intent of SCHIP nor should it be an outcome from this debate.

SCHIP is an example where children and pregnant women can receive medical coverage. This eliminates a large number of those classified as ''uninsured.'' As the differing bills appear from both House and Senate committees of jurisdiction, and I hope that this language is included.

FQHC

For those others that are not children or pregnant women, they too have access options, namely, Federally Qualified Health Centers. This patient access to health care even without ''insurance'' serves an estimated 15 million ''uninsured.'' So what are FQHCs? An FQHC provides comprehensive primary health, oral, and mental health/substance abuse services to persons in all stages of the life cycle.

Both SCHIP and FQHCs are designed to help the poorest, youngest and underserved communities. But what about those individuals that can afford to pay some of their health care services? There are two programs available that assist individuals and companies in receiving health care coverage: Health Savings Accounts and Association Health Plans.

Health Savings Accounts

Health Savings Accounts (HSA) are a tax-advantaged medical savings account available to taxpayers who are enrolled in a high deductible health plan—a health insurance plan with lower premiums and higher deductibles than a traditional health plan. It is sometimes referred to as a catastrophic health insurance plan.

For an HSA, the funds contributed to the account are not subject to income tax, but can only be used to pay for qualified medical expenses. But perhaps one of the best parts of having an HSA is that all deposits to an HSA become the property of the policyholder, regardless of the source of the deposit. Patients actually have a say in how and where they spend their health care dollars. Additionally, any funds deposited, but not withdrawn each year, will carry over into the next year.

The popularity of HSAs has grown considerably since its inception. Although numbers are only verified from 2005, by December of that year, some 3.2 million individuals had coverage. Of that number, 42% of individuals or families with income below $50,000 were purchasing HSA-type insurance. This fact notes that HSAs are an affordable option. In addition, the number of previously uninsured HSA plan purchasers over the age of 60 nearly doubled, proving that the plans are also accessible to people of all ages.

Association Health Plans

Of the roughly 46 million Americans who are uninsured, nearly 60% of them are employed by small business. And some of these individuals prefer a more traditional health plan but their small business employers find offering a health benefit simply too expensive. To unburden small business owners, Congress devised the concept of association health plans.

AHPs allow small businesses to arrange their health benefits alongside other like-minded organizations there by spreading risk among a much larger group, lowering the administrative costs, and providing better benefit options to employees.

Physician Workforce Issues

But are we putting the cart before the horse? In a conversation with Alan Greenspan, before he stepped down as Chairman of the Federal Reserve, he was concerned about whether there would be an adequate labor supply to meet the demand for medical services in the future. The truth is our country faces an oncoming physician shortage. We need to ensure that doctors in practice today, those at the peak of their clinical abilities remain in practice and provide services to those with the most complex issues. So what steps do we need to take to ensure physicians remain in practice?

Medical Liability

First we must tackle an issue that continues to plague the medical community: medical liability. We need common-sense medical liability reform to protect patients, to stop the skyrocketing costs associated with frivolous lawsuits, to make health care more affordable and accessible for all Americans, and to keep necessary services in communities that need them most.

We need a national solution. Currently, our state-to-state coverage leaves us in jeopardy and tangles up the court system. Amazingly, we have an excellent example of the direction we should be taking on the Federal level by modeling legislation after what the State of Texas already has in place, which is getting ready to celebrate its 4th anniversary as law.

Texas brought together the major stakeholders in the discussion, including doctors, hospitals and nursing homes. Now some might point out that manufacturers were not present, but the State was clear to leave open the option for their participation at a later date.

My home State of Texas had a significant problem as far as medical liability was concerned. We had lost most of our medical liability insurers from the State. They had simply closed shop and left because they could not see a future in providing medical liability insurance in Texas. We went from 17 insurers down to 2 by the end of 2002. Rates were increasing year over year. My personal situation, running my own practice, was that rates were increasing by 30 percent to 50 percent a year.

In 2003, Texas State legislature passed a medical liability reform based off the California law, but updated for the 21st Century. Instead of a single $250,000 cap, there was a $250,000 cap on noneconomic damages as it pertained to physicians, hospitals and to second hospitals or nursing homes—an aggregate cap of $750,000.

So how has the Texas plan faired? Remember that I stated we dropped from 17 insurers down to 2 because of the medical liability crisis in the State? Now, we are back up to 14 or 15 carriers; and, most importantly, those carriers have returned to the State of Texas without an increase in premium.

In 2006, only three years after passage, Medical Protective had a 10% rate cut which was its 4th reduction since April of 2005. Texas Medical Liability Trust declared an aggregate of 22% cuts. Advocate MD filed a 19.9% rate decrease and Doctors Company announced a 13% rate cut. These are real numbers. That is a significant reversal. More options mean better prices and a more secure setting for medical professionals to remain in practice.

Probably one of the most important unintended beneficiaries of this was the small community not-for-profit hospital, who was self-insured for medical liability. They have been able to take money out of those escrow accounts and put it back to work for those hospitals capitalize improvements, paying nurse's salaries, the kinds of things you want your small not-for-profit community-based hospitals to be doing, not holding money in escrow against that inevitable liability suit that might occur.

I took the language of the Texas plan, worked it so it would fit within our constructs here in the House of Representatives and offered it to the ranking member of the Budget Committee. He had scored by the Congressional Budget Office, and the Texas plan, as applied through the House of Representatives to the entire 50 States, would yield a savings of $3.8 billion over 5 years. Not a mammoth amount of money when you are talking about a $2.999 trillion budget, but savings nonetheless, monies that we will leave on the table in this budgetary cycle that could have gone to some of the other spending priorities that we hear so much about. You can look to me for legislative action on this issue in the coming months.

Consider this—a 1996 study done by Stanford University revealed that in the Medicare system alone, the cost of defensive medicine was approximately $28 to $30 billion a year. That was 10 years ago. I suspect that number is higher today. That's why we can scarcely afford to continue the trajectory we are on with the medical liability issue in this country.

Another consideration is those young people getting out of college who are considering medical school. The current system keeps young people out of the practice of a health care for their livelihood because of the burden that we put upon them. This is the thing that we have to consider. We have to focus on how we are affecting our physician workforce

for the future, how we are affecting the health care that you are our children and our children's children will receive.

Physician Workforce and Graduate Medical Education Enhancement Act of 2007

Part of ensuring this future workforce includes helping the younger doctors with residency programs. The funny thing about doctors is we to have a lot of inertia. A lot of us tend to practice very close to where we did our training. The bill I propose is designed to get more training programs in areas that are underserved, like rural or inner cities. We must get young doctors training in locations where they are actually needed.

The ''GME,'' or Graduate Medical Education, Enhancement Act of 2007 would develop a program that would permit hospitals that do not traditionally operate a residency training program the opportunity to start a residency training program to build the physician workforce of the future.

On average, it costs $100,000 a year to train a resident and that cost for a smaller hospital can be prohibitive. Because of this cost consideration, my bill would create a loan fund available to hospitals to create residency training programs where none has operated in the past. The programs would require full accreditation and generally be focused in rural, suburban, inner urban or frontier community hospitals.

A diverse group, including the American College of Emergency Physicians and American Osteopathic Association, supports my GME legislation.

High-Need Physician Specialty Workforce Incentive Act of 2007

Locating young doctors where they are needed is part of solving the impending physician shortage crisis that will affect the entire health care system. Another aspect that must be considered is training doctors for high-need specialties.

My High-Need Physician Specialty Act of 2007 will establish a mix of scholarships, loan repayment funds, and tax incentives to entice more students to medical school and create incentives for those students and newly minted doctors. This program will have an established repayment program for students who agree to go into family practice, internal medicine, emergency medicine, general surgery, or OB/GYN, and practice in underserved areas. It will be a 5-year authorization at $5 million per year.

This bill would provide additional educational scholarships in exchange for a commitment to serve in a public or private nonprofit health facility determined to have a critical shortage of primary care physicians.

Prominent groups such as AARP, the American College of Physicians, and the ERISA Industry Committee, support my High-Need Specialty legislation.

Physician Stabilization

So far we in addressing the Physician Workforce crisis we have discuss medical liability, the placement of doctors in locations of greatest need and the financial concerns of encouraging doctors to remain in high-need specialties. The next portion of my remarks is related to perhaps the largest group of doctors in this country and certainly, the largest and still-growing group of patients—our ''Baby Boom'' generation and the Medicare program.

As the baby boomers age and retire, the demand for services is going to go nowhere but up. And if the physician workforce trends continue as they are today, we may be not talking about funding a Medicare program, we may be talking about there is no one there to take care of the seniors.

Year-after-year there is a reduction in reimbursement payments from the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services to physicians for the services they provide their Medicare patients. This is not a question of doctors wanting to make more money; it is about stabilized repayment for services already rendered. And it isn't affecting just doctors—this problem affects patients. It becomes a real crisis of access.

Not a week goes by that I don't get a letter or fax from some physician who says, ''You know what, I have just had enough and I am going to retire early. I am no longer going to see Medicare patients in my practice, or I am going to restrict the procedures that I offer Medicare patients.''

Unfortunately, I know that is happening because I saw it in the hospital environment before I left the practice of medicine to come to Congress. But I also hear it in virtually every town hall that I do back in my district. Someone will raise their hand and say, ''How come on Medicare, you turn 65 and you have got to change doctors?''

And the answer is because their doctor found it no longer economically viable to continue to see Medicare patients because they weren't able to pay the cost of delivering the care. They weren't able to cover the cost of providing the care.

Medicare payments to physicians are modified annually using the sustainable growth rate (SGR) formula. Because of flaws in the process, the SGR mandated physician fee cuts in recent years have been only moderately averted by last minute fixes. If no long-term congressional action is implemented, the SGR will continue to mandate fee cuts.

Unlike hospital reimbursement rates, which follow closely the Medicare Economic Index (MEI), which measures the increasing costs of providing care, physicians reimbursements do not. In fact, Medicare payments to physicians cover only about 65% of the actual cost of providing patient services. Can you imagine any industry or company that would continue in business if they received only 65% of what they spent.

But the simple repeal of the SGR is simply too cost prohibitive. But if we do that over time, perhaps we can bring that cost down to a level where it is manageable.

Paying physicians fairly will extend the careers of many physicians who are now in practice who would otherwise opt out of the Medicare program, seek early retirement, or restrict those procedures that they offer to their Medicare patients.

It also has the effect of insuring an adequate network of doctors available to older Americans as this country makes the transition to the physician workforce of the future.

In my new physician payment stabilization bill, the SGR formula would be repealed in 2010, 2 years from now, but would also provide incentive payments based on quality reporting and technology improvements.

Recently, CBO estimated that the practical payment effect from my bill would bring a 1.5% update in 2008, a 1.0% update in 2009, and a complete elimination by 2010. The CBO score calculates a savings of $40 billion off the total price tag of an SGR elimination.

These incentive payments would be installed to protect the practicing physician against that 5% cut that will likely occur in 2008 and 2009. That would be voluntary. No one would be required to participate in the quality program or the technology improvement, but it would be available to those doctors or practices who wanted to offset the proposed cuts that will occur in physician reimbursement in the 2 years until the formal repeal of the SGR happens.

Now I know this is perhaps a frightening thought to some physicians—I'm sure I would have been wary at first when I ran my own practice. But step back and view the long-term solution. This is the only logical, economically viable and I reiterate long-term solution.

Now, why do it that way? Why not just bite the bullet and let's go ahead and get the SGR out of the way and get it repealed? Remember, it costs a tremendous amount of money to do that. Another problem that we have in Congress is we are required to submit all legislation to the Congressional Budget Office to find out how much it costs. If we are going to be spending the taxpayers' money, how much are we going to spend? Over what time will we spend it?

Because of the constraints of the Congressional Budget Office, we are not allowed to do dynamic scoring. Unfortunately, we can't do look-ahead and say, ''You know, I think if we do this, we are going to save some money.''

But, by postponing the repeal of the SGR by 2 years' time; taking the savings that occurs during that time and applying it to the SGR formula; we may actually get a number that is doable as far as releasing the SGR and replacing it with the Medicare Economic Index similar to the way hospitals are reimbursed.

One of the main thrusts of this bill is to require the Center for Medicare and Medicare Services to look at their top 10 conditions that drive the highest percentage of payments. The bill would require CMS to adopt reporting measures relating to these conditions that have already been developed. It is not reinventing the wheel. The American Medical Association Physician Consortium has already developed those reporting measures that drive that spending so high.

You know, the old famous bank robber Willie Sutton, when he was asked why do you rob the bank, he said that is because that is where the money is. Let's go to those top 10 things where the greatest amount of money is spent, because that is where the greatest amount of savings can occur. If we can deliver care in a more timely fashion and if we can improve outcomes, we are actually going to spend less. And by focusing on those top 10 programs, at least initially, that will be the greatest return on investment for CMS and ultimately will be the greatest return on investment for retiring the SGR.

The same considerations may apply to the Medicaid program as well, so it will be a very useful exercise to go through that and identify those top 10 conditions. And where cost savings may be most easily gathered, not only will it have an improving effect on Medicare, but I suspect on Medicaid as well.

This will also include a report back to doctors on what their volume and intensity is. This information will not be made generally public, but it will be made available to the individual physician so they can see how they are doing; how they are doing relative to other doctors in

their practice, other doctors in their community, and other doctors around the country. Physicians are a competitive group; I assure you these reports will be read.

Health Information Technology

There is also going to be a provision in the bill to help physicians' offices bring their information technology, their infrastructure, hardware and software, up to a standard where it will begin to derive benefit not only the patient and the practice but also to the Medicare system in general.

The provision will also create a safe harbor that will allow clinics, physicians' offices, and hospitals to share health information technology platforms. These standards will be established and available to physicians' practices so they will understand how they need to comply. The standards must be established no later than January 1, 2008.

Back in the day, I wasn't always a big proponent of things like electronic records. I wasn't sure if it would deliver the payoff that people said it would. But here is a picture of the medical records department in Charity Hospital in New Orleans. This picture was made in January 2006, about 4 or 5 months after Hurricane Katrina and the downtown flooding that occurred. It is the medical records room. These records are ruined. You can see this is not smoke or soot damage; this is black mold that is growing on the records. You look there and it almost goes on to infinity, tens of thousands, hundred of thousands of records that were active, ongoing charts of people's medical conditions absolutely now unavailable. No one is going to get into that medical records department and risk inhaling the spores from the mold that is covering those charts.

This is the kind of problem that you can get into with a paper medical record. Of course the youngsters of today, the college students of today, the young physicians of today, they understand this very well. They are all connected and wired in. They would no more imagine turning in or doing a paper for one of their classes where they just had a single copy, a single paper copy, the old adage ''the dog ate my homework,'' most students will have a paper on a CD or on a flash drive readily accessible and retrievable in many forms. We should do no less with our medical records.

But it costs money to do this. It is going to require a push from the private sector. I prefer to think of a bonus payment as being an inducement, an enticement for physicians' offices to participate in this type of program. But it is also just good medicine. It is good patient care.

We all heard about the troubles at Walter Reed Hospital a few months ago. I went out to Walter Reed probably the week after the story broke in the Washington Post and talked to this young man who took me around Building 18. Yes, there was some concern. It was a crummy building. But his biggest concern was spending hours and hours with his medical record, his service record, going through the various parts and highlighting things. He had a yellow marker, a highlighter, highlighting parts of his medical record because this is how he was going to establish the benefits that he was going to receive in the VA system for his disability.

He said ''I can spend 20 man-hours putting this medical record together and it ends up on someone's desk and it doesn't get picked up, and then no one can find it and I have to start all over again.'' That was his main message to me that day.

Now the VA system has been indeed very forward-thinking in its embrace of electronic medical records and its investment in information technology. The problem is the medical records from the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs do not possess the interoperability necessary to make this type of activity unnecessary.

Delivering value to the patient is of paramount importance. And it is my contention that if we do make the bonus payment generally available to physicians, this will be something that they will embrace. There is a learning curve, to be sure. It is going to slow people down a little bit initially. But ultimately, the rapidity of the system will be impressive. And even in a smaller physician's office the ability to never have to wait while they find your medical records would be amazing. Once physicians and medical offices become used to this technology, they will embrace it.

Another unintended benefit to providing incentives for health information technology is the rapidity with which the health care system itself can learn. When I say the health care system, I specifically address the possibility that treatments and the delivery of quality health care services can be faster, cost less and simply be better. Wouldn't it be great to have that information and know what treatments were effective and what treatments were only marginal? That information can be literally at a physician's fingertips with the right type of computer architecture and technology environment. I believe the time has come that we do need to embrace that.

So the physician payment stabilization bill will include a federal incentive to implement health information technology along with provisions providing safe harbors for the sharing of software, technical assistance and hardware, as well as the creation of consortiums.

Health Care Price Transparency

Once you have established measures that will allow for a medical workforce in the future—through a nation medical liability law, ensuring a medical workforce in areas that you need and in locations that need them, and by stabilizing physician reimbursements, you can refine other health care projects.

Perhaps the foundation of understanding health care is to understand its costs. The average consumer has little understanding about how much any service or prescription drug costs because they are supplemented by the government and often their employer. This must change.

In August 2006, President Bush issued an executive order calling for increased transparency within the federal government's health care agencies. The legislation I have proposed in the past is an extension of that executive order, giving States the tools to become part of a necessary solution for health care consumers.

The bill would require states establish health care transparency requirements for hospitals and health plans, as well as conduct a study on what information is most useful to consumers.

For example, the Texas Hospital Association has created a web-based tool that allows consumers to compare hospital-to-hospital cost called Texas PricePoint. This website assists consumers that are considering nonemergency procedures at area hospitals. Texas health care consumers now can view and compare charge data on inpatient hospital services. Couple this data with hospital quality information and consumers will be able to truly shop for health services based on quality and cost. What a remarkably simply idea that is literally educating and engaging the consumer in making his or her health care choices. Knowledge is an essential tool for making informed decisions.

This type of planning tool should be made available to all patients, across the country, at any time. Think of it like a ''Travelocity'' or ''Priceline'' for health care servIces. Wouldn't that be terrific? The long and the short of it is that this is possible. And Congress can make this happen if we commit ourselves to the process.

Conclusion

I recognize that all of this information is technically complex, sometimes even boring to listen to, but it nonetheless tells an incredibly important story. It is the story of how the most advanced, most innovative and most appreciated health care system in the world needs help. The end of the story should read ''happily ever after.'' So how do we reach that conclusion? The last chapter should read, ''A Private Industry Leads to a Healthy Ending.''

As I stated in the beginning of this hour, we are in a debate that will forever change our health care system. We must understand what is working in our system and what is not. We cannot delay making changes and bringing health care into the 21st Century.

I believe that the only way this can work is if we allow the private sector to lay the foundation for improvements. The pillars of the amazing health system we have now must be rooted in the bedrock of a thriving private sector, not on the shaky ground of a public system that has proven costly and inefficient in other countries.

We must devote our work in Congress to building a stronger private sector in health care. History has proven this is a tried and true method. We can bring down the number of uninsured, increase patient access, stabilize the physician workforce, modernize through technology and bring transparency to the system. Each of these goals is within our grasp. We must only have the foresight and determination to achieve each goal.

There is a reason why people come from around the world to the United States for health care treatments—we are the best, but we must make adjustments to remain at the top of the game.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for July 16 and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Ms. BORDALLO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business in the district.

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. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CONAWAY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, July 24.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, July 24.

Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of ''National Purple Heart Recognition Day''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution commending the 1st Brigade Combat Team/34th Infantry Division of the Minnesota National Guard upon its completion of the longest continuous deployment of any United States military unit during Operation Iraqi Freedom; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at midnight), the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, July 18, 2007, 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:

2543. A letter from the Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Manufactured Home Dispute Resolution Program [Docket No. FR-4813-F-03] (RIN: 2502-AH98) received June 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2544. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a copy of proposed legislation to update the National Housing Act and modernize the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) mortgage insurance program to ensure that the FHA continues to play a key role in serving low- and moderate-income homebuyers; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2545. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a copy of proposed legislation to reauthorize the American Dream Downpayment Act, Section 271 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2546. A letter from the Senior Vice President for Resource Management, Export-Import Bank, transmitting the Bank's Buy American Act reporting for fiscal year 2006, pursuant to section 837 of Division A of the fiscal year 2006 Departments of Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act, Pub. L. 109-115; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2547. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Republic of Panama pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2548. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Alachlor, Chlorothalonil, Metribuzin; Denial of Objections [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0050; FRL-8135-3] received July 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2549. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Minnesota [EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0772; FRL-8439-7] received July 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2550. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Minnesota [EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0772; FRL-8439-8] received July 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2551. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determination of Attainment, Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Indiana; Redesignation of the Clark and Floyd Counties 8-hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment [EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0715; FRL-8440-2] received July 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2552. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determination of Attainment, Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Indiana; Redesignation of LaPorte County To Attainment for Ozone [EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0459; FRL-8440-4] received July 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2553. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determination of Attainment, Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Indiana; Redesignation of the South Bend-Elkhart 8-hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment [EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0305; FRL-8440-3] received July 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2554. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Public Hearings and Submission of Plans [EPA-HQ-OAR-2006-0903; FRL-8439-6] received July 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2555. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 07-07 informing of an intent to sign the Joint U.S./U.K. Weapon and Sensor Resource Management Algorithm Development and Evaluation Project Arrangement between the United States and the United Kingdom, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2556. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to Section 62(a) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed lease of defense articles to the Government of Singapore (Transmittal No. 02-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2557. A letter from the Chairman, Broadcasting Board of Governors, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2006 to March 31, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2558. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, Library of Congress, transmitting the Annual Report of the Library of Congress, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 139; to the Committee on House Administration.

2559. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled, ''Report to Congress on the Social and Economic Conditions of Native Americans: Fiscal Years 1995-2000,'' pursuant to Section 811A of the Native American Programs Act of 1974; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2560. A letter from the Acting Chair, Federal Subsistence Board, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska, Subpart C; Nonrural Determinations (RIN: 1018-AT99) received July 12, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2561. A letter from the Assistant Director, Fisheries & Habitat Conservation U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Injurious Wildlife Species; Silver Carp (Hypophthalmichthys molitrix) and Largescale Silver Carp (Hypophthalmichthys harmandi) (RIN: 1018-AT29) received July 12, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2562. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Peck's Cave Amphipod, Comal Springs Dryopid Beetle, and Comal Springs Riffle Beetle (RIN: 1018-AU75) received July 16, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2563. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removing the Bald Eagle in the Lower 48 States From the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife (RIN: 1018-

AF21) received July 16, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2564. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of draft legislation entitled, ''Cooperative Conservation Enhancement Act''; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2565. A letter from the Acting Director, Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's report on the Minerals Management Service Royalty-in-Kind Operation for Fiscal Year 2006, as required by Section 342 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2566. A letter from the Executive Director, Department of the Interior, transmitting the 2005 annual report of the National Center for Preservation Technology and Training (National Center), pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2567. A letter from the Associate Deputy Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a draft bill entitled, ''The Fiscally Responsible Energy Amendments Act of 2007''; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2568. A letter from the Director, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's 2006 report to Congress on the ''The Status of U.S. Fisheries''; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2569. A letter from the Director, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's biennial report regarding the administration of the Endangered Species Act from October 1, 2004 to September 30, 2006; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2570. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a copy of the Annual Report to Congress on the Refugee Resettlement Program for the period October 1, 2004 through September 30, 2005 as required by section 413(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1523(a); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2571. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Civil Works, Department of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting the Administration's position on the budgeting for the Cedar Bayou, Texas Navigation Improvement Project; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2572. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Civil Works, Department of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting the Administration's position on the budgeting for the Unalaska, Alaska Navigation Improvement Project; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2573. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the 2005 Annual Report of the Assistant Secretary for Veterans' Employment and Training of the Department of Labor, pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 4107(c); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2574. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a copy of a draft bill entitled, ''To amend title 38, United States Code, to improve veterans' health care benefits, and for other purposes''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2575. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — United States — Jordan Free Trade Agreement [USCBP-2007-0001 CBP Dec. 07-50] (RIN: 1505-AB75) received June 25, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2576. A letter from the Chief, Border Security Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Advance Electronic Presentation of Cargo Information for Truck Carriers Required to be Transmitted through ACE Truck Manifest as Ports in the States of Maine and Minnesota [CBP Dec. 07-53] received July 12, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2577. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — United States-Morocco Free Trade Agreement [USCBP-2007-0056 CBP Dec. 07-51] (RIN: 1505-AB76) received June 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2578. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — EXTENSION OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS IMPOSED ON PRE-CLASSICAL AND CLASSICAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL OBJECTS AND BYZANTINE PERIOD ECCLESIASTICAL AND RITUAL ETHNOLOGICAL MATERIAL FROM CYPRUS [CBP Dec. 07-52] (RIN: 1505-AB80) received July 12, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2579. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Guidance under Subpart F Relating to Partnerships [TD 9326] (RIN: 1545-BE34) received July 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2580. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Withholding Exemptions [TD 9337] (RIN: 1545-BE21) received July 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. OBEY: Committee on Appropriations. Report on the Revised Suballocation of Budget Allocations for Fiscal Year 2008 (Rept. 110–236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 3056. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the authority of the Internal Revenue Service to use private debt collection companies, to delay implementation of withholding taxes on government contractors, to revise the tax rules on expatriation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POMEROY (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3057. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure and foster continued patient quality of care by establishing facility and patient criteria for long-term care hospitals and related improvements under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 3058. A bill to amend chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code, to provide full payments under such chapter to units of general local government in which entitlement land is located, to provide transitional payments during fiscal years 2008 through 2012 to those States and counties previously entitled to payments under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural 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. BARTON of Texas (for himself, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. BUYER, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas):

H.R. 3059. A bill to increase the corporate average fuel economy standards for automobiles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BOREN (for himself and Mr. HALL of Texas):

H.R. 3060. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and title 5, United States Code, to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans and Federal employees health benefit plans provide coverage of colorectal cancer screening; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and Labor, and Oversight and Government Reform, 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. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 3061. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require that Medicare prescription drug plans using formularies cover all drugs included in 6 specified therapeutic categories, to establish protective requirements for coverage determinations, reconsiderations, and appeals related to such drugs, and to require annual reports on such determinations, reconsiderations, and appeals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 3062. A bill to authorize appropriations to provide for South Pacific exchanges, provide technical and other assistance to

countries in the Pacific region through the United States Agency for International Development, and authorize appropriations to provide Fulbright Scholarships for Pacific Island students; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

H.R. 3063. A bill to revise the boundary of Martin Van Buren National Historic Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRAVES:

H.R. 3064. A bill to suspend certain nonessential visas, in order to provide temporary workload relief critical to the successful reorganization of the immigration and naturalization functions of the Department of Homeland Security, to ensure that the screening and monitoring of arriving immigrants and nonimmigrants, and the deterrence of entry and settlement by illegal or unauthorized aliens, is sufficient to maintain the integrity of the sovereign borders of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL of New York:

H.R. 3065. A bill to amend title 38 United States Code, to modify the rate of reimbursement of State and local agencies administering veterans education benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARE (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois):

H.R. 3066. A bill to permit pass-through payment for reasonable costs of certified registered nurse anesthetist services in critical access hospitals notwithstanding the reclassification of such hospitals as urban hospitals, including hospitals located in ''Lugar counties'', and for on-call and standby costs for such services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 3067. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to exempt small public housing agencies from the requirement of preparing an annual public housing agency plan; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3068. A bill to prohibit the award of contracts to provide guard services under the contract security guard program of the Federal Protective Service to a business concern that is owned, controlled, or operated by an individual who has been convicted of a felony; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 3069. A bill to reaffirm and clarify the Federal relationship of the Dunlap Band of Mono Indians as a distinct federally recognized Indian Tribe; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 3070. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize additional compensation to be paid to certain veterans in receipt of compensation for a service-connected disability rated totally disabling for whom a family member dependent on the veteran for support provides care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 3071. A bill to require the immediate redeployment of United States Armed Forces from Iraq; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. TANCREDO, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 3072. A bill to reduce the risks to Colorado communities and water supplies from severe wildfires, especially in areas affected by insect infestations, to provide model legislation that may be applied to other States experiencing similar insect infestations or other forest-related problems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Ways and Means, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Science and Technology, 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. MARSHALL (for himself, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. BACHUS):

H. Res. 552. A resolution calling on the Government of the People's Republic of China to remove barriers to United States financial services firms doing business in China; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. REYES, Mr. CARTER, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. POE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GOHMERT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DICKS, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KIND, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. LEE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MCHUGH, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. FARR, and Mr. ALTMIRE):

H. Res. 553. A resolution mourning the passing of former First Lady, Lady Bird Johnson, and celebrating her life and contributions to the people of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BACA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. HILL, Ms. WATSON, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ARCURI, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Ms. WATERS):

H. Res. 554. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Passport Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Mr. TANCREDO, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MCHUGH, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 25: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 135: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 136: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 154: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CHANDLER, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 171: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 406: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Mr. WU.

H.R. 436: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 462: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 507: Mr. HOLT, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. SOLIS.

H.R. 592: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 601: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. FORTUÑO.

H.R. 642: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 643: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HERGER, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. MICA.

H.R. 687: Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 694: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 726: Mr. WEXLER and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 729: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 741: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 743: Mrs. BONO, Mr. BOREN, Ms. CLARKE, and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 760: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. SALAZAR.

H.R. 779: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 784: Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. HILL.

H.R. 790: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 864: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 867: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 871: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 895: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 920: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BERRY, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. PICKERING.

H.R. 946: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 969: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BACA, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1014: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1023: Ms. HARMAN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.

H.R. 1040: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1046: Mr. BOOZMAN.

H.R. 1061: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1064: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BARROW, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Ms. WATSON.

H.R. 1078: Mr. WYNN and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1091: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1125: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 1142: Mr. DENT, Mr. HARE, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 1232: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BARROW, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 1233: Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 1279: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 1299: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 1302: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 1304: Mr. SPACE, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 1308: Ms. MATSUI and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1320: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 1343: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 1389: Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. KUHL of New York, and Mr. WALSH of New York.
H.R. 1400: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota and Mr. REYNOLDS.
H.R. 1416: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 1456: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
H.R. 1466: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
H.R. 1479: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1498: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1506: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1512: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. HILL.
H.R. 1518: Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 1532: Mr. ORTIZ.
H.R. 1533: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1534: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1542: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1553: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Ms. GRANGER, and Ms. SOLIS.
H.R. 1609: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1620: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1671: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 1709: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 1779: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.
H.R. 1814: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.
H.R. 1818: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1869: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1871: Mr. EMANUEL.
H.R. 1878: Mr. NADLER and Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 1909: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1911: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 1932: Ms. SOLIS and Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 1952: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 1956: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 2003: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2015: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. WATSON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SALAZAR, and Mr. BACA.
H.R. 2016: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 2017: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 2035: Mr. SPACE.
H.R. 2036: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 2045: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 2060: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. WELCH of Vermont.
H.R. 2065: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 2070: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H.R. 2095: Mr. OBEY and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 2111: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 2116: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. AKIN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. TERRY, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 2122: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2126: Mr. ROTHMAN and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 2164: Mr. BOOZMAN.
H.R. 2183: Mr. PUTNAM and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 2188: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.
H.R. 2244: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2248: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2265: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 2268: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. BUYER, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. BAKER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 2287: Mr. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 2295: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 2298: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 2325: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 2343: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 2353: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. REYES, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2371: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 2395: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 2421: Mr. WATT and Mr. BECERRA.
H.R. 2464: Mr. MCNULTY and Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 2470: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. SPACE.
H.R. 2484: Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 2490: Mr. GINGREY.
H.R. 2505: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Mr. HILL.
H.R. 2568: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida and Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 2605: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. HALL of New York.
H.R. 2606: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2610: Mr. WEINER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2623: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 2677: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 2715: Mr. KUCINICH and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 2716: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
H.R. 2743: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2744: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. WATERS, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 2787: Ms. HARMAN and Mr. LAMPSON.
H.R. 2802: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 2809: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 2821: Mr. SALAZAR.
H.R. 2831: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. WATSON, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. BARROW, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 2840: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 2842: Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SÃNCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. STARK, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. WATSON.
H.R. 2905: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
H.R. 2925: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2927: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WAMP, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MELANCON, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. FOXX, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. BOREN, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. REGULA, Mr. MICA, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 2929: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. FILNER, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 2941: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. MCNULTY.
H.R. 2943: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 2966: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 2991: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 3007: Mr. BUYER.
H.R. 3012: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. REGULA.
H.R. 3030: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 3031: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3037: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 3042: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3046: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. SULLIVAN.
H.J. Res. 44: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. WELCH of Vermont.
H.J. Res. 45: Mr. LAMPSON.
H.J. Res. 46: Mr. WAMP.
H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. COHEN.
H. Con. Res. 22: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. UPTON.
H. Con. Res. 108: Ms. LEE.
H. Con. Res. 120: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H. Con. Res. 138: Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 160: Mr. WELLER of Illinois and Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.
H. Res. 95: Mr. MOORE of Kansas and Mr. ETHERIDGE.
H. Res. 235: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H. Res. 258: Mr. HONDA, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. LATHAM.
H. Res. 282: Ms. GIFFORDS.
H. Res. 303: Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, and Mr. SALAZAR.
H. Res. 433: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.
H. Res. 484: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. LAMPSON.
H. Res. 508: Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H. Res. 509: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H. Res. 515: Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. HARE, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BOREN, Mr. TANNER, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. BERRY.
H. Res. 528: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HODES, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. SARBANES.
H. Res. 530: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. CLYBURN.

H. Res. 535: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Ms. BERKLEY.

H. Res. 536: Ms. KILPATRICK.

H. Res. 539: Mr. COHEN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. GORDON, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H. Res. 541: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ISSA, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SNYDER, and Ms. BORDALLO.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT NO. 7: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 0.25 percent.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY MR. EHLERS OF MICHIGAN

AMENDMENT NO. 8: Page 125, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. 522. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for ''DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—Departmental Management—Salaries and Expenses'', and increasing the amount made available for ''DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—School Improvement Programs'' (for activities authorized by part B of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965), by $15,665,760.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. FLAKE

AMENDMENT NO. 9: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the Burpee Museum, Rockford, Illinois, for educational programming and exhibits.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''Institute of Museum and Library Services—Office of Museum and Library Services: Grants and Administration'' is hereby reduced by $150,000.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. FLAKE

AMENDMENT NO. 10: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the South Carolina Aquarium, Charleston, South Carolina, for exhibits and curriculum.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''Institute of Museum and Library Services—Office of Museum and Library Services: Grants and Administration'' is hereby reduced by $150,000.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. FLAKE

AMENDMENT NO. 11: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the Corporation for Jefferson's Poplar Forest, Forest, Virginia, for expansion of exhibits and outreach.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''Institute of Museum and Library Services—Office of Museum and Library Services: Grants and Administration'' is hereby reduced by $200,000.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. FLAKE

AMENDMENT NO. 12: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the Kansas Regional Prisons Museum, Lansing, Kansas, for educational and outreach programs.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''Institute of Museum and Library Services—Office of Museum and Library Services: Grants and Administration'' is hereby reduced by $100,000.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. FLAKE

AMENDMENT NO. 13: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the Shedd Aquarium, Chicago, Illinois, for exhibits and community outreach.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''Institute of Museum and Library Services—Office of Museum and Library Services: Grants and Administration'' is hereby reduced by $150,000.

H.R 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. FLAKE

AMENDMENT NO. 14: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for Rhode Island College, Providence, Rhode Island, for development of a Portuguese and Lusophone Studies Program.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''Department of Education—Higher Education'' is hereby reduced by $100,000.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. FLAKE

AMENDMENT NO. 15: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the American Ballet Theatre, New York, New York, for educational activities.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''Department of Education—Innovation and Improvement'' is hereby reduced by $150,000.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. FLAKE

AMENDMENT NO. 16: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the American Jazz Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, for exhibits, education programs, and an archival project.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''Institute of Museum and Library Services—Office of Museum and Library Services: Grants and Administration'' is hereby reduced by $200,000.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. FLAKE

AMENDMENT NO. 17: Page 97, line 16, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $255,625,000)''.

Page 97, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $255,625,000)''.

Page 98, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $55,000,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. FLAKE

AMENDMENT NO. 18: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for Missouri State University, Springfield, Missouri, for a college preparatory pilot program .

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''Department of Education—Innovation and Improvement'' is hereby reduced by $100,000.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. FLAKE

AMENDMENT NO. 19: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the Exploratorium, San Francisco, California, for its Bay Area Science Teacher Recruitment, Retention, and Improvement Initiative.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''Department of Education—Innovation and Improvement'' is hereby reduced by $300,000.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 20: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

The amount otherwise provided in this Act for ''The Office for Civil Rights'' of the Department of Education is hereby decreased by $2,000,000 and increased by $2,000,000.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCAUL OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 21: Page 25, line 22, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 84, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 84, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

AMENDMENT NO. 22: 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 carry out the evaluation of the Upward Bound program described in the absolute priority for Upward Bound Program participant selection and evaluation published by the Department of Education in the Federal Register on September 22, 2006 (71 Fed. Reg. 55447 et seq.).

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MRS. MUSGRAVE

AMENDMENT NO. 23: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 0.5 percent.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MRS. MUSGRAVE

AMENDMENT NO. 24: Page 42, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $175,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. PLATTS

AMENDMENT NO. 25: Page 24, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $27,995,000)''.

Page 25, line 22, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,163,000)''.

Page 63, line 4, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,942,000)''.

Page 77, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

Page 77, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

Page 92, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $900,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

AMENDMENT NO. 26: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to carry out the Entertainment Education Program of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

(b) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the Ombudsman Program of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

(c) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to provide additional rotating pastel lights, zero-gravity chairs, or dry-heat saunas for its fitness center.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. SHAYS

AMENDMENT NO. 27: Page 25, line 22, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

Page 107, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. WHITFIELD

AMENDMENT NO. 28: Page 48, line 26, after the aggregate dollar amount insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 63, line 4, after the first dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. WHITFIELD

AMENDMENT NO. 29: Page 49, line 25, before the period insert ''*Provided further*, That, of the funds made available under this heading, $10,000,000 is for carrying out section 399O of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g–4)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 30: At the end of bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The amount otherwise provided in this Act for ''DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT—Office of Civil Rights'' is hereby decreased by $2,000,000 and increased by $2,000,000.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 31: At the end of bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The amount otherwise provided in this Act for ''DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED'' is hereby decreased by $2,000,000 and increased by $2,000,000.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MRS. MUSGRAVE

AMENDMENT NO. 32: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used, directly or indirectly, to provide, subsidize, advertise, teach, or advocate, any form of attachment therapy.

(b) In this section, the term ''attachment therapy'' means any therapeutic or parenting technique or method used on a child which involves physical coercion, non-emergency physical restraint, age regression, recapitulation of a developmental stage, deprivation of physical needs, isolation or close confinement, or any other intervention fitting a category of child abuse as determined by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Administration for Children and Families.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HOLT

AMENDMENT NO. 33: Page 96, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. 307. The amounts otherwise provided by this title are revised by reducing the amount made available for ''Departmental Management—Program Administration'', and increasing the amount made available for ''School Improvement Programs'' (for carrying out activities authorized by part B of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965), by $25,000,000.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HOLT

AMENDMENT NO. 34: Page 58, line 21, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $21,000,000)''.

Page 60, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $21,000,000)''.

Page 60, line 13, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $15,00,000)''.

Page 60, line 15, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $6,000,000)''.

Page 63, line 4, insert after the first dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $21,000,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HOLT

AMENDMENT NO. 35: Page 58, line 21, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $42,450,000)''.

Page 60, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $42,450,000)''.

Page 60, line 13, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $29,280,000)''.

Page 60, line 15, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $13,170,000)''.

Page 63, line 4, insert after the first dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $42,450,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MS. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 36: Page 77, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $46,500,000)''.

Page 77, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $46,500,000)''.

Page 83, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $46,500,000)''.

Page 83, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $46,500,000)''.

Page 83, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $46,500,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT NO. 37: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Public Broadcasting Service to sponsor events at the Filmmaker Lodge at the Sundance Film Festival.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT NO. 38: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds in this Act may be used to employ workers described in section 274A(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a(h)(3)).

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT NO. 39: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 4.8 percent.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT NO. 40: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

None of the funds in this Act may be used for the following:

Children Uniting Nations, Los Angeles, CA;

Crisis Nursery of the Ozarks, Springfield, MO;

Jefferson County, Golden, CO for child abuse prevention and treatment programs;

New York Center for Children, New York, NY;

Shelter for Abused Women, Winchester, VA;

Arrowhead Economic Opportunity Agency, Virginia, MN;

Beth El House, Alexandria, VA;

Children's Home Society of South Dakota, Sioux Falls, SD;

Christian Outreach of Lutherans, Waukegan, IL;

Individual Development Account, City of Detroit, MI;

Early childhood resource centers, City of Fort Worth, TX;

Services for New Americans program, City of San Jose, CA;

Cliff Hagan Boys and Girls Club—Mike Horn Unit, Owensboro, KY;

Communities In Schools, Bell-Coryell Counties, Inc., Killeen, TX;

Covenant House Florida, Ft. Lauderdale, FL;

Eisner Pediatric and Family Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA;

Every Citizen Has Opportunities, Inc., Leesburg, VA;

Family Center of Washington County, Montpelier, VT;

First 5, Alameda County, San Leandro, CA;

Friendship Circle of the South Bay, Redondo Beach, CA;

Greater New Britain Teen Pregnancy Prevention, Inc., New-Britain, CT;

Hamilton-Madison House, New York, NY;

Healthy Learners Dillon, Columbia, SC;

Helping Children Worldwide, Herndon, VA;

Hennepin County Human Services and Public Health Department, Minneapolis, MN;

Hillside Family of Agencies, Rochester, NY;

Hope Village for Children, Meridian, MS;

Horizons for Homeless Children, Boston, MA;

New American's Center, Kingsborough Community College, Brooklyn, NY;

L.I.F.T. Women's Resource Center, Detroit, MI;

Lawrence County Social Services, New Castle, PA;

Lutheran Social Services, Duluth, MN;

Marcus Institute, Atlanta, GA;

Mary's Family, Orlean, VA;

Mecklenburg County, Charlotte, NC;

Missouri Bootheel Regional Consortium, Portageville, MO;

Monterey County Probation Department, Salinas, CA;

Nashua Adult learning Center, Nashua, NH;

National Energy Assistance Directors' Association, Washington, DC;

Network for Instructional TV, Inc., Reston, VA;

Nurses for Newborns Foundation, St. Louis, MO;

Organization of the NorthEast, Chicago, IL;
Pediatric Interim Care Center, Kent, WA;
Public Health Department, Solano County, Fairfield, CA;
Sephardic Bikur Holim of Monmouth County, Deal, NJ;
Stephen F. Austin State University, Nacogdoches, TX, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL;
Susan Wesley Family Learning Center, East Prairie, MO;
TLC for Children and Families, Inc., Olathe, KS;
United Way Southeastern Michigan, Detroit, MN;
Midwest Clinic for Autism Spectrum Disorders, University of Central Missouri, Warrensburg, MO;
Visitation Home, Inc., Yardville, NJ;
Allied Jewish Federation of Colorado, Denver, CO;
Amalgamated Warbasse Houses, Inc., Brooklyn, NY;
California Senior Legal Hotline, Sacramento, CA;
Durham-Chapel Hill Jewish Federation, Durham, NC;
Howard Brown Health Center, Chicago, IL;
Jewish Community Services of South Florida, North Miami, FL;
Jewish Family and Children's Service of Minneapolis, Minnetonka, MN;
Jewish Family Service of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM;
Jewish Family Service, Los Angeles, CA;
Jewish Family Services of Delaware, Inc., Wilmington, DE;
Jewish Federation of Central New Jersey, Scotch Plains, NJ;
Jewish Federation of Greater Monmouth County, NJ;
Jewish Federation of Greater New Haven, Woodbridge, CT;
Jewish Federation of Middlesex County, South River, NJ;
Jewish Social Service Agency, Fairfax, VA;
Shenandoah Area Agency on Aging, Front Royal, VA;
United Jewish Communities of Metro West, NJ, Parsippany, NJ;
National Center on Smart Technology, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL;
Adler Aphasia Center, Maywood, NJ;
Advocate Good Shepard Hospital, Barrington, IL;
Alameda County Public Health Department, Office of AIDS Administration, Oakland, CA;
Vannie E. Cook Jr. Cancer Foundation, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, TX;
Bayside Community Center, San Diego, CA;
Berean Community & Family Life Center, Brooklyn, NY;
Bienestar Human Services, Inc., Los Angeles, CA;
Boys and Girls Club of Delaware County, Jay, OK;
Center for Prevention of Childhood Obesity, California State University-Fullerton, Fullerton, CA;
Charles R. Drew Wellness Center, Columbia, SC;
Charter County of Wayne, Michigan, Detroit, MI;
Chez Panisse Foundation, Berkeley, CA;
Children's Hunger Alliance, Columbus, OH;
Center for Injury Research and Policy, Columbus Children's Research Institute, Columbus, OH;
Marin Breast County Research, County of Marin, San Rafael, CA;
CREATE Foundation, Tupelo, MS;
County-wide Physical Fitness Assessment Pilot Project, DuPage County, Wheaton, IL;
East Carolina University, Brody School of Medicine, Greenville, NC;
EI Puente, Brooklyn, NY;
Friends of the Congressional Glaucoma Caucus Foundation, Lake Success, NY;
Haitian American Association Against Cancer, Inc., Miami, FL;
Healthy Eating Lifestyle Principles, Monterey, CA;
Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters—Florida, Coral Gables, FL;
Ingalls Development Foundation, Harvey, IL;
International Rett Syndrome Association, Clinton, MD;
Kips Bay Boys and Girls Club, Bronx, NY;
Asthma Education Center, Long Island University, Brooklyn, NY;
Louisville Department of Public Health and Wellness, Louisville, KY;
Center for Physical Activity, Middle Tennessee State University;
Murfreesboro, TN;
Myositis Association, Washington, DC;
Natividad Medical Center, Salinas, CA;
Nevada Cancer Institute, Las Vegas, NV;
North Shore Health Project, Gloucester, MA;
Partners Enabling Active Rural Living Institute, Plymouth State University, Plymouth, NH;
Providence Cancer Center, Portland, OR;
Pulmonary Hypertension Association, Silver Spring, MD;
San Antonio Metropolitan Health District, San Antonio, TX;
SHAREing and CAREing, Astoria, NY;
Silent Spring Institute, Newton, MA;
Southeastern Center for Emerging Biologic Threats, Atlanta, GA;
St. Elizabeth's Medical Center, Wabasha, MN;
St. Francis Medical Center Foundation, Lynwood, CA;
St. John's Regional Medical Center, Oxnard, CA;
St. John's Well Child and Family Center, Los Angeles, CA;
Interdisciplinary Diabetes Prevention and Management Consortium, University of Arizona College of Medicine, Tucson, AZ;
University of Findlay Center for Public Health Preparedness, Findlay, OH;
Center for Minority Health, Education, Research and Outreach, University of North Texas Health Science Center, Fort Worth, TX;
Initiative to Combat Obesity in Early Childhood, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL;
South Texas Border Health Disparities Center, University of Texas Pan American, Edinburg, TX;
Texas Health Science Center-Houston, School of Public Health, University of Texas, Brownsville, TX;
Virgin Islands Perinatal Inc., Christiansted, VI;
Diabetes Research Initiative, Voorhees College, Denmark, SC;
Wayne County Department of Public Health, Detroit, MI;
WestCare Foundation, Las Vegas, NV
Yale New Haven Hospital, New Haven, CT;
YBH Project, Inc., Albany, GA;
Access Health, Inc., Muskegon, MI,;
Bedford Ride, Bedford, VA;
Bi-State Primary Care Association, Concord, NH;
City and County of San Francisco Department of Public Health, San Francisco, CA;
Detroit Primary Care Access Project, Coleman A. Young Muncipal Center, City of Detroit, MI;
Waterbury Hospital, City of Waterbury, CT;
Gadsden County, FL Quincy, FL;
Jefferson Area Board for Aging, Charlottesville, VA;
Orange County's Primary Care Access Network, Orlando, FL;
Piedmont Hospital, Atlanta, GA;
Thurston-Mason County Medical Society, Olympia, WA;
Valley Hospice, Inc., Steubenville, OH;
ABC Unified School District, Cerritos, CA;
Chicago Academy and Chicago Academy High School, Academy for Urban School leadership, Chicago, IL;
Action for Bridgeport Community Development, Inc., Bridgeport, CT;
African-American Male Achievers Network, Inc., Inglewood, CA;
Akron Public Schools, OH for a Math, Science, and Technology Community;
Alamance-Burlington School District, Burlington, NC;
All Kinds of Minds, Chapel Hill, NC;
American Ballet Theatre, New York, NY;
Amistad America, New Haven, CT;
An Achievable Dream, Inc., Newport News, VA;
Center for Mathematics Education and Innovation, Angelo State University, San Angelo, TX;
Apache County Schools, St. Johns, AZ;
Arab City Schools, Arab, AL;
AVANCE, Inc, EI Paso, TX;
AVANCE, Inc., Del Rio, TX;
AVANCE, Inc., Waco, TX;
Barat Education Foundation, Lake Forest, IL;
Bay Haven Charter Academy Middle School, Lynn Haven, FL;
Language and Literacy Center, Baylor University, Waco, TX;
Best Buddies International, Miami, FL;
Best Buddies Maryland, Baltimore, MD;
Big Top Chautauqua, WI;
Idaho SySTEMic Solution, Boise State University, Boise, ID;
Principal's Institute, Bowie State University, Bowie, MD;
Boys & Girls Club of Hawaii, Honolulu, HI;
Boys & Girls Town of Missouri, Columbia, MO;
Boys and Girls Club of San Bernardino, CA;
Automotive Technology Program, Bradford Area School District, Bradford, PA;
Student Success Center, Brookdale Community College, Lincroft, NJ;
Bushnell Center for the Performing Arts, Hartford, CT;
Cal State Northridge Assessment and Accountability, California State University Northridge, CA;
At-Risk Youth Development Program, California State University, San Bernardino, CA;
Canton Symphony Orchestra Association, Canton, OH;
National Music Education Program, Carnegie Hall, New York, NY;
Central County Occupational Center, San Jose, CA;
Central Pennsylvania Institute of Science and Technology, State College, PA;
Centro de Salud Familiar Le Fe, EI Paso, TX;
District Wide Instruction Using Technology, Charlotte County School District, Port Charlotte, FL;
Andre Agassi College Preparatory Academy, Charter School Development Foundation, Las Vegas, NY;
Place to Be After Three Middle School Program, City of Fairfield, CA;
City Schools, City of Gadsden, AL;
Burbank Elementary School, City of Hayward, Hayward, CA;
Indianapolis Center for Education Entrepreneurship, City of Indianapolis, Indianapolis, IN;
Newark Elementary School, City of Newark, Newark, CA for after-school programs;
Jacqueline Walsh School of the Performing and Visual Arts, City of Pawtucket School Department, Pawtucket, RI;
Pembroke Pines—Florida State University Charter School, City of Pembroke Pines, FL;

Early Start/Great Start School Readiness Initiative, City of San Jose, CA;
City of Springfield, MO for the Ready to Learn Program;
City of Whittier, Whittier, CA for after-school programs, which may include equipment;
City School District of New Rochelle, New Rochelle, NY for after-school learning centers;
Clark County School District, Las Vegas, NY for the Education Executive Leadership Program;
Newcomer Academy, Clark County School District, Las Vegas, NV;
Clovis Unified School District, Center for Advanced Research Technology, Clovis, CA;
College Summit, Inc., Washington, DC;
Communities in Schools—Northeast Texas, Mount Pleasant, TX;
Communities in Schools of Cochran and Bleckley County, Cochran, GA;
Communities in Schools of Coweta, Inc., Newnan, GA;
Communities in Schools of Fitzgerald—Ben Hill County, Fitzgerald, GA;
Communities in Schools of Tacoma, Tacoma, WA;
Communities in Schools, Austin, TX;
Communities in Schools, San Fernando Valley, Inc., North Hills, CA;
Community Development Commission of the County of Los Angeles, Monterey Park, CA;
Community Service Society, New York, NY;
Connecticut Technical High School System, Middletown, CT;
Contra Costa College, Bridges to the Future Program, San Pablo, CA;
Cooperative Educational Service Agency No. 11;
Cooperative Educational Service Agency No. 12, Ashland, WI;
Cooperative Educational Service Agency No. 5, Portage, WI;
Cooperative Educational Service Agency No. 9, Tomahawk, WI;
County of San Diego, San Pasqual Academy, Escondido, CA;
Cuyahoga County Board of County Commissioners, Cleveland, OH;
Starting Stronger Early Learning Initiative, Delaware Department of Education, Dover, DE;
Detroit Youth Foundation, Detroit, MI;
DNA EpiCenter, Inc., New London, CT;
Duval County Public Schools, Instructional Technology Program, Jacksonville, FL;
Edgar School District, Computer Technology center, Edgar, WI;
Edison and Ford Winter Estates Education Foundation;
Education Partnership, Providence, RI;
Education Service Center, Region 12, Hillsboro, TX;
Ennis Independent School District, Advanced Via Individual Determination (AVID) Program, Ennis, TX;
Metropolitan Arts and Technology High School, Envision Schools, San Francisco, CA;
Erskine College, Fine Arts Network for Assisting Rural Education, Due West, SC;
Exploratorium, San Francisco, CA;
Franklin Sherman Elementary School, Chesterbrook Elementary School Fairfax County Public Schools, Fairfax, VA;
Fairfax County Public Schools, Falls Church, emergency medical services (EMS) Academy, Fairfax, VA;
Fairhope Center for the Arts, Bay Minette, AL;
Families In Schools, Los Angeles, CA;
Fayetteville Technical Community College, Congressional Scholars Program, Fayetteville, NC;
Forward in the Fifth, Somerset, KY;
Friends of the Children National, Portland, OR;
George B. Thomas, Sr. Learning Academy, Inc., Bethesda, MD;
Girl Scouts of the USA, Fair Play Initiative, New York, NY;
Graham County Schools, Safford, AZ.;
Guam Public School System, Chamorro language instruction program, Hagatna, GU;
Hamilton Wings, Elgin, IL;
Harris County Department of Education, Cooperative for After-School Enrichment, Houston, TX;
Harvey Public School District 152, Harvey, IL;
Hawaii Department of Education, Honolulu, Assistance to Low-Performing Schools, HI;
Hawk Mountain Sanctuary Association, Kempton, PA;
Helen Keller International, New York, NY;
High Plains Regional Education Cooperative, Raton, NM;
Work-Scholarship Connection Youth Employment Training Academy, Hillside Family of Agencies, Rochester, NY;
Hoke County Schools, technology equipment, Raeford, NC;
Houston Independent School District, Houston, TX;
I KNOW I CAN, Columbus, OH;
In Tune Foundation Group, Washington, DC;
Independent School District 181, Brainerd Teacher Support System, Brainerd, MN;
Wyandanch High School, Institute for Student Achievement, Lake Success, NY;
Institute for Student Achievement, Lake Success, NY;
Iowa City Community School District, ICCDS Technology Based Early Literacy Program, Iowa City, IA;
Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana—Southeast, Madison, IN;
Jacob Burns Film Center, Pleasantville, NY;
Jazz at Lincoln Center, New York, NY;
Jefferson County Public Schools, Technology Instruction, Golden, CO;
Jersey Shore Area School District, Jersey Shore, PA;
JFYNetWorks, Boston, MA;
Malden, Revere, and Framingham, MA;
Joplin School District, Joplin, MO;
Jumpstart for Young Children, Inc., Boston, MA;
Jumpstart for Young Children, San Francisco, CA;
Kelberman Center, Utica, NY;
KIPP Foundation, San Francisco, CA;
KIPP Delta College Preparatory School, Helena, AR;
21st Century Community Learning Center, Logan Middle School, La Crosse School District, La Crosse, WI;
Learning Point Associates/North Central Regional Education laboratory, Naperville, IL;
Lee Pesky Learning Center, Boise, ID;
Lemay Child & Family Center, St. Louis, MO;
Los Angeles Conservation Corps, Los Angeles, CA;
Louisiana Arts and Sciences Museum, Baton Rouge, LA;
Louisiana Tech University, IDEA Place and SciTEC Classroom, Ruston, LA;
Lower East Side Conservancy, New York, NY;
Madison County Schools, Computer Lab, Richmond, KY;
Mesa Unified School District, Making Every Student Accountable (MESA), Mesa, AZ;
Military Heritage Center Foundation, Carlisle, PA;
Miller County Development Authority, Colquit, GA;
Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation, Washington, DC;
Milwaukee Public Schools, Community Learning Centers, Milwaukee, WI;
Minnesota Humanities Commission, St. Paul, MN;
Mississippi University for Women, Columbus, MS;
Missouri State University, Springfield, MO;
Monroe County School District, Technology Plan, Key West, FL;
Montgomery County Public Schools, Transition of Scientists from the Laboratory to the Classroom Project, Rockville, MD;
Mote Marine Laboratory, Sarasota, FL;
Mount Hood Community College, Child Development Center, Gresham, OR;
National Center for Electronically Mediated Learning, Inc., Milford, CT;
National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Oakland, CA;
National Cued Speech Association, Bethesda, MD;
National Flight Academy, Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL;
National Resource Center for Deafblindness, East Greenville, PA;
National Teacher's Hall of Fame, Emporia, KS;
Neighborhood Youth Association, Venice, CA;
New Mexico Public Education Department, Summer Reading and Math Institutes, Santa Fe, NM;
Newton Public Schools, Improvement of Education Program, Newton, KS;
North Carolina Agricultural and Technical University, Suspension Intervention Program, Greensboro, NC;
North Carolina Central University, Academic Enrichment Saturday Academy, Durham, NC;
North Carolina Symphony, Raleigh, NC;
North Carolina Technology Association Education Foundation, Raleigh, NC;
North Philadelphia Youth Association, Philadelphia, PA;
Northeast Louisiana Family Literacy Interagency Consortium;
Northern Tier Industry & Education Consortium, Dimock, PA;
Norwich Public School System, limited English proficiency, Norwich, CT;
Oakland Unified School District, Technology Integration Project, Oakland, CA;
O'Neill Sea Odyssey, Santa Cruz, CA;
OneWorld Now!, Seattle, WA;
Ossining Union Free School District, Ossining, NY;
Parent Institute for Quality Education, San Diego, CA;
PE4life, Kansas City, MO for physical education programs in Titusville;
People for People, Philadelphia, PA;
Peru State College, Peru, Adopt-a-High School Program, NE;
Philadelphia Academies, Inc., Philadelphia, PA;
Pinal County Education Service Agency, Florence, AZ;
Polk County Public Schools, Augmentative and Assistive Technology Support Project, Bartow, FL;
Port Chester—Rye Union Free School District, Port Chester, NY;
Project GRAD USA, Philadelphia, PA;
Purdue University Calumet, Urban Academy, Hammond, IN;
Queens Theatre in the Park, Flushing, NY;
Renwick Public Schools, Technology Program, Andale, KS;
Rio Rancho Public Schools, Cyber Academy, Rio Ranch, NM;
Riverside Community College, School of Nursing/Middle College, Riverside, CA;
Riverside County Office of Education, Riverside, CA;

Rockdale County Public Schools, Conyers, GA;
Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology, Terre Haute, IN;
Salesian Boys and Girls Club of Los Angeles, CA;
San Bernardino City Unified School District, English and Academic Skills for English Learners program, San Bernardino, CA;
San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools, San Bernardino, CA;
San Joaquin County, Stockton, CA for its San Joaquin A Plus tutoring program;
San Mateo County, Redwood City, CA;
School Board of Broward County, Fort Lauderdale, FL;
Schultz Center for Teaching and Leadership, Jacksonville, FL;
Selden/Centereach Youth Association, Selden, NY;
Silver Crescent Foundation, Charleston, SC;
Sociedad Latina, Roxbury, MA;
Southwestern University, Center for Hispanic Studies, Georgetown, TX;
Springboard for Improving Schools, San Francisco, CA;
Academy of Arts and Academics, Springfield Public School District No. 19, Springfield, OR;
St. Mary's County Public Schools, Science and Technology Academies, Leonardtown, MD;
Elko, Nye, Douglas, Lyon and Churchill school districts, State of Nevada Department of Education;
Summit Educational Resources, Getzville, NY;
Susannah Wesley Community Center, Honolulu, HI;
Tampa Metropolitan YMCA, Tampa, FL;
TSU Lab School, Texas Southern University, Houston, TX;
Tomas Rivera Policy Institute, Los Angeles, CA;
Mayor's Office of Children and Learning, Town of Cumberland, Cumberland, RI;
Towson University, Towson, MD for an education partnership with the City of Baltimore, Baltimore City Public School System and the Cherry Hill community;
Tracy Joint Unified School District, Tracy, CA;
Tri-County Educational Service, Wooster, OH;
Trumbull County Educational Service Center, Niles, OH;
Tulsa Public Schools, Academic Center, Tulsa, OK;
Union County Public Schools, classrooms and labs, Monroe, NC;
Union Free School District of the Tarrytowns, after-school and professional development programs, Sleepy Hollow, NY;
University of Akron, Akron, STEM2 Education and Career Pathways, OH;
University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Manufacturing Engineering Education, AL;
USD 259, Wichita Public Schools, Wichita, KS;
Valle Undo School District, Critical Math Technology, South EI Monte, CA;
Venango Technology Center, Oil City, PA;
Vision Therapy Project, Casper, WY;
Visually Impaired Preschool Services, Louisville, KY;
Washington College, Chestertown, MD;
Center for Community Education, Enrichment and Urban Studies, Washington State University, Tacoma, WA;
WE CARE San Jacinto Valley, Inc., San Jacinto, CA;
West Contra Costa Unified School District, John F. Kennedy High School Mary Gaddis;
Architecture Construction and Engineering Academy, Richmond, CA;
White-Williams Scholars, Philadelphia, PA;
Widener University, school readiness programs, Chester, PA;
Wildlife Information Center, Inc., Slatington, PA;
Williamsburg County First Steps, Kingstree, SC;
Yonkers Public Schools, Yonkers, after school and summer academic enrichment programs, NY;
Youngstown City School District, pre-apprenticeship program, OH;
Youngstown State University, Rich Center for Autism Technology, Youngstown, OH;
YWCA of Gary, Gary, IN;
Adelante Development Center, Albuquerque. NM;
Agudath Israel of America Community Services. Inc., Brooklyn, NY;
Arc of Blackstone Valley, Pawtucket, RI;
Bellingham Technical College, Bellingham, WA;
Bismarck State College, Instrumentation and Control Program, Bismarck, ND;
Center for Excellence in Technology, Telecommunications and Economic Development,
Brookdale Community College, Center for Excellence in Technology, Telecommunitcationa and Economic Development, Lincroft, NJ;
Center for Employment Training, San Jose, CA;
Central Carolina Tech College, Central Allied Health Sciences Center, Sumter, SC;
Central Maine Community College, Precision Manufacturing Advantage, Auburn, ME;
Chinese-American Planning Council, New York, NY;
City College of San Francisco, Welcome Back Center, CA;
City of Alexandria, automotive industry workforce development and training initiative, VA;
City of Baltimore, MD for the Park Heights Partnership for Jobs;
City of Milwaukee, WI for a project to train youth in construction trades;
City of Palmdale, Palmdale, CA for a business resource network to enhance worker skills development;
Suffolk Workforce Development Center, City of Suffolk, VA;
Clarian Health Partners, Indianapolis, IN;
College of Southern Maryland, La Plata, MD;
Community Learning Center, Fort Worth, TX;
Des Moines Area Community College, Arkeny, IA;
Dillard University, New Orleans Workers Initiative, New Orleans, LA;
East Los Angeles Community Union, Los Angeles, CA;
Easter Seals Arc of Northeast Indiana, Inc., Fort Wayne, IN;
Edgar Campbell Foundation, Philadelphia, PA;
Employment & Economic Development Department of San Joaquin County, Stockton, CA;
Essex County Community Organization, Lynn, MA;
Foundation of the Delaware County Chamber, Media, PA;
Goodwill of Southern Nevada, North Las Vegas, NV;
Greater Akron Chamber, Akron, OH;
Groden Center, Providence, RI;
Guam Community College, Mangilao, Guam;
Hamilton County Government, Chattanooga, TN;
Home of Life Community Development Corp., Chicago, IL;
Homecare Workers Training Center, Los Angeles, CA;
International Fellowship of Chaplains, Inc., Saginaw, MI;
Iowa Valley Community College, Education and Training Center, Marshalltown, IA;
Center for Cybersecurity, Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana—Columbus Region, Indianapolis, IN;
Center for Health Information Technology, Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana Lafayette, Indianapolis, IN;
Kansas City Kansas Community College, Workforce Investment demonstration program, Kansas City, KS;
Northeast Ohio Advanced Manufacturing Institute, Kent State University Trumbuli County, Warren, OH;
Louisiana Delta Community College, Monroe, LA;
Louisiana National Guard, Carville, LA;
Manufacturing Association of Central New York, Syracuse, NY;
Massachusetts College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences, Healthcare Professional Training Initiative, Manchester, NH;
McHenry County Community College, F.A.S.T. Solutions, Woodstock, IL;
Minot State University, Job Corp Fellowship Training Program, Minot, ND;
Neighborhood First Program, Inc., Bristol, PA;
Newlife Academy of Information Technology, East Liverpool, OH;
North West Pasadena Development Corp., Pasadena, CA;
Northcott Neighborhood House, Milwaukee, WI;
Oakland Community College, Emerging Sectors Educational Consortium, Bloomfield Hills, MI;
Opportunity, Inc., Highland Park, IL;
Our Piece of the Pie, Hartford, CT;
Parish of Rapides Career Solutions Center, Alexandria, LA;
Philadelphia Shipyard Development Corporation, Philadelphia, PA;
Residential Construction Academy, Piedmont Virginia Community College, Charlottesville, VA;
Poder Learning Center, Chicago, IL;
Precision Manufacturing Institute, Meadville, PA;
Project One Inc., Louisville, KY;
Project QUEST, Inc., San Antonio, TX;
PRONTO of Long Island, Inc., Bayshore, NY;
Schoenbaum Family Enrichment Center, Charleston, WV;
Schuylkill Intermediate Unit 29, Marlin, PA;
South Bay Workforce Investment Board, Hawthorne, CA;
Southeast Missouri State University, Economic Workforce Development Program, Cape Girardeau, MO;
Southern University at Shreveport, Allied Health Program, Shreveport, LA;
Southside Virginia Community College, Heavy Equipment training Center, Alberta, VA;
Southwestern Oklahoma State University, Western Oklahoma Business Commercialization Center, Weatherford, OK;
St. Louis Agency on Training and Employment, SI. Louis, MO;
Towson University, Towson, MD;
United Mine Workers of America, Career Center, Washington, PA;
University of West Florida, Hometown Heroes Teach Program, Pensacola. FL;
Veteran Community Initiatives. Inc., Johnstown, PA;
Vincennes University, Heavy Equipment Training program, Vincennes, IN;
Wayne County, NY Planning Department, Lyons, NY;
West Los Angeles College, Culver City, CA;
Women Work and Community, Augusta, ME;
A.O. Fox Memorial Hospital, Oneonta, NY;

Access Community Health Network, Chicago, IL;
Adirondack Medical Center, Saranac Lake, NY;
Adrian College, Nursing Program, Adrian, MI;
Adventist GlenOaks Hospital, Glendale Heights, FL;
Adventist Health, Roseville, CA;
Alamo Community College System, San Antonio, TX;
Alaska Addictions Rehabilitation Services, Inc., Wasilla, AK;
Alderson-Broaddus College, Philippi, WV;
Alice Hyde Medical Center, Malone, NY;
Alleghany Memorial Hospital, Sparta, NC;
Alle-Kiski Medical Center, Natrona Heights, PA;
Alliance for NanoHealth, Houston, TX;
AltaMed Health Services Corp., Los Angeles, CA;
American Oncologic Hospital, Fox Chase Cancer Center, Philadelphia, PA;
LBJ Medical Center, American Samoa, Pago Pago, AQ;
Amite County Medical Services, Liberty, MS;
Arnold Palmer Hospital, Orlando, FL;
Ashland County Oral Health Services, Ashland, OH;
Asian Americans for Community Involvement, San Jose, CA;
Association for Utah Community Health, Salt Lake City, UT;
Atlantic Health Systems, Florham Park, NJ;
Avis Goodwin Community Health Center, Dover, NH;
Avista Adventist Hospital, Louisville, CO;
Bad River Tribe of Lake Superior Chippewa, Odanah, WI;
Ball Memorial Hospital, Muncie, IN;
Baltimore City Health Department, Baltimore, MD;
Baltimore Medical System, Baltimore, MD;
Baptist Health Medical Center—Heber Springs, Heber Springs, AR;
Barnert Hospital, Paterson, NJ;
Barnes-Kasson County Hospital, Susquehanna, PA;
Barre Family Health Center, Barre, MA;
Bay Area Medical Clinic, Marinette, WI;
BayCare Health System, Clearwater, FL;
Baylor Research Institute, Dallas, TX;
Bayonne Medical Center, Bayonne, NJ;
Baystate Health Systems, Springfield, MA;
Beaumont Hospital, Royal Oak, MI;
Health Science Center, Belmont University, Nashville, TN;
Bemidji State University, nurse training program, Bemidji, MN;
Benedictine Hospital, Kingston, NY;
Benefis Healthcare, Great Falls, MT;
Berea Health Ministry Rural Health Clinic, Inc., Berea, KY;
Bloomington Hospital Foundation, Bloomington IN;
Bloomsburg Hospital, Bloomsburg, PA;
Blount Memorial Hospital, Maryville, TN;
Boone Hospital Center, Columbia, MO;
Boriken-Neighborhood Health Center, New York, NY;
Boscobel Area Health Care Boscobel, WI;
Boston Medical Center, Boston, MA;
Boston University Medical School, amyloidosis treatment, Boston, MA;
Bridge Community Health Clinic, Wausau, WI;
Bridgeport Hospital, Bridgeport, CT;
Brockton Neighborhood Health Center, Brockton, MA;
Brookside Community Health Center, San Pablo, CA;
Brunswick County, Bolivia, NC;
Bryan W. Whitfield Hospital, Demopolis, AL;
Bureau County Health Clinic, Princeton, IL;
Cactus Health Services, Inc., Sanderson, TX;
California Hospital Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA;
California State University, Department of Nursing, Bakersfield, CA;
Camillus House, Inc, Miami, FL;
Canonsburg General Hospital, Canonsburg, PA;
Cape Cod Free Clinic and Community Health Center, Mashpee, MA;
Capital Park Family Health Center, Columbus, OH;
Cardinal Stritch University, Agape Community Center, Milwaukee, WI;
Carolinas HealthCare System, Charlotte, NC;
Carroll County Regional Medical Center, Carrollton, KY;
Outpatient Mental Health Clinic, Carroll County Youth Service Bureau, Westminster, MD;
Center for Health Equity, Louisville, KY;
Virtual Medical Skills Center, Central Wyoming College, Riverton, WY;
CentroMed, San Antonio, TX;
Champlain Valley Physician's Hospital, Plattsburgh, NY;
Charles A. Dean Memorial Hospital, Greenville, ME;
Chatham County Safety Net Collaborative, Savannah, GA;
Cherry Street Health Services, Grand Rapids, MI;
Children's Friend and Family Services, Salem, MA;
Children's Home of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA;
Children's Hospital and Clinics of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN;
Children's Hospital and Health System, Milwaukee, WI;
Children's Hospital at Albany Medical Center, Albany, NY;
Children's Hospital Medical Center of Akron, Akron, OH;
Children's Hospital of Orange County, Mission Viejo, CA;
Children's Hospital of the King's Daughters, Norfolk, VA;
Children's Hospital, Denver, CO;
Mobile Pediatric Health Simulation Center, Children's Hospitals and Clinics of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN;
Children's Medical Center, Dayton, OH;
Children's Memorial Hospital, Chicago, IL;
Children's National Medical Center, Washington, DC;
Children's Specialized Hospital, Mountainside, NJ;
Chippewa Valley Hospital, Durand, WI;
Chiricaua Community Health Centers, Inc., Elfrida, AZ;
Christian Health Care Center of New Jersey, Wyckoff, NJ;
Christian Sarkine Autism Treatment Center, Indianapolis, IN;
Christus Santa Rosa's Children's Hospital, San Antonio, TX;
Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Cincinnati, OH;
Citrus County Board of County Commissioners, Inverness, FL;
Travis County Hospital District, City of Austin, TX;
City of Chesapeake, Pilot Project Use of Technology for Targeted Public Health Intervention, VA;
Senior Citizens' Center, City of Hueytown, AL;
City of Oakland, Oakland Youth Center, CA;
City of Stockton, Community & Health Center/Airport Way, CA;
City of Stonewall, Stonewall Primary Care Clinic, OK;
Clarion Health Center, Clarion, PA;
Cleveland Clinic Huron Hospital, East Cleveland, OH;
Cobb County Government, Marietta Senior Health Center, GA;
Coffeyville Regional Medical Center, Coffeyville, KS;
Coles County Council on Aging, Mattoon, IL;
College Misericordia, Dallas, PA;
Collier County, Health Care Access for the Uninsured, Naples, FL;
Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO;
Columbia Memorial Hospital, Hudson, NY;
Columbus Children's Hospital, Columbus, OH;
Communi Care, Inc., Columbia, SC;
Community College of Aurora, Combined Position Emission Tomography (PET) and Computer Tomography (CT) Scanner, Aurora, CO;
Community Dental Services, Albuquerque, NM;
Community Health Care, Tacoma, WA;
Community Health Center of Franklin County, Turners Falls, MA;
Community Health Works, Forsyth, GA;
Community Hospital of Bremen, Bremen, IN;
Community Hospital TeleHealth Consortium, Lake Charles, LA;
Gleason House, Community Medical Centers, Stockton, CA;
Comprehensive Community Action Program (CCAP), Cranston, RI;
Connecticut Hospice, Inc., Branford, CT;
Cook Children's Medical Center, Fort Worth, TX;
Cooperative Education Service Agency 11 Rural Health Dental Clinic, Turtle Lake, WI;
County of Modoc, Modoc Medical Center, Alturas, CA;
County of Peoria, Bel-Wood Nursing Home, Peoria, FL;
County of San Diego, Public Health Services, CA;
Crousee Hospital, Syracuse, NY;
Moss Higher Education Center, Crowder College—Nevada Campus, Nevada, MO;
Crozer-Chester Medical Center, Upland, PA;
Cumberland Medical Center, Crossville, TN;
Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center, Lebanon, NH;
Delaware Technical and Community College, Shaping the Future of Delaware Citizens program, Dover, DE;
Denver Health and Hospital Authority, Denver, CO;
Des Moines University and Broadlawns Medical Center, Des Moines, IA;
Detroit Primary Care Access, Detroit, MI;
Dixie County primary care facility, Cross City, FL;
Dodge County Hospital, Eastman, GA;
Drew County Memorial Hospital, Monticello, AR;
DuBois Regional Medical Center, DuBois, PA;
Metabolic Institute, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC;
East Tennessee Children's Hospital, Knoxville, TN;
East Tennessee State University College of Pharmacy, Johnson City, TN;
Easter Seals of Mahoning, Trumbull, and Columbiana Counties, Youngstown, OH;
Eddy County, Regional Substance Abuse Rehabilitation Center, Carlsbad, NM;
Edgemoor Hospital, Santee, CA;
Eisenhower Medical Center, Rancho Mirage, CA;
Azusa Health Center, EI Proyecto del Barrio, Arleta, CA;
EI Proyecto del Barrio, Winnetka, CA;
Elizabeth City State University, School of Mathematics, Elizabeth City, NC;
Emerson Hospital, Concord, MA;
Englewood Hospital and Medical Center, Englewood, NJ;

Excela Health, Mt. Pleasant, PA;
Fairfield Medical Center, Lancaster, OH;
Fairview Southdale Hospital, Edina, MN;
Harmony Center, Family and Children's Aid, Danbury, CT;
Family Behavioral Resources, Greensburg, PA;
Family Center of the Northern Neck, Inc; White Stone, VA;
Family Health Center of Southern Oklahoma, Tishomingo, OK;
Family HealthCare Network, Visalia, CA;
Family Medicine Spokane, Spokane, WA;
Florida Hospital College of Health Sciences, Orlando, FL;
Autism Research and Treatment Center, Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, FL;
Floyd Valley Hospital, Le Mars, IA;
Freeman Health System, Joplin, MO;
Fulton County Medical Center, McConnellsburg, PA;
Gardner Family Health Network, Inc., San Jose, CA;
Gaston College, Health Education Institute, Dallas, NC;
Gateway to Care, Houston, TX;
Autism Early Identification Diagnostic and Treatment Center, Gertrude A. Barber Center, Erie, PA;
Glen Rose Medical Center, Glen Rose, TX;
Glendale Adventist Medical Center, Glendale, CA;
Glens Falls Hospital, Glens Falls, NY;
Grady Health Systems, Atlanta, GA;
Grandview Hospital, Dayton, OH;
Greater Hudson Valley Family Health Center, Inc., Newburgh, NY;
Greater New Bedford Community Health Center, New Bedford, MA;
Griffin Hospital, Derby, CT;
Gritman Medical Center, Moscow, ID;
Gundersen Lutheran Health System, West Union, IA;
Gunderson Lutheran, Decorah, IA;
Halifax Regional Health System, South Boston, VA;
Hamilton Community Health Network, Flint, MI;
Hampton University, Cancer Treatment Initiative, Hampton, VA;
Harris County Hospital District, Houston, TX;
Harris Methodist Erath County Hospital, Stephenville, TX;
Hatzoloh EMS, Inc., Monsey, NY;
Hawkeye Community College, Health and Fitness Center, Waterloo, IA;
Healing Tree Addiction Treatment Solutions, Inc., Sterling, CO;
HEALS Dental Clinic, Huntsville, AL;
HealthCare Connection, Cincinnati, OH;
HealthEast Care System, St. Paul, MN;
Heartland Community Health Clinic, Peoria, IL;
Hekloen Institute for Medical Research Beloved Community Wellness Program, Chicago, IL;
Helen DeVos Children's Hospital, Grand Rapids, MI;
Henry Mayo Newhall Memorial Hospital, Valencia, CA;
Highland Community Hospital, Picayune, MS;
Highlands County, Veteran Services Building, Sebring, FL;
Holy Name Hospital, Teaneck, NJ;
Home Nursing Agency, Altoona, PA;
Hormel Foundation, Austin, MN;
Hospice of Northwest Ohio Toledo Center, Toledo, OH;
Hospice of the Western Reserve, Cleveland, OH;
Houston County Hospital District, Crockett, TX;
Howard Community College, Radiologic Technology Program, Columbia, MD;
Hudson Alpha Institute for Biotechnology, Huntsville, AL;
Hudson Headwaters Health Network, Inc., Glens Falls, NY;
Humility of Mary Health Partners, Youngstown, OH;
Humphreys County Memorial Hospital, Belzoni, MS;
Hunterdon Medical Center, Flemington, NJ;
Hunter's Hope Foundation, Orchard Park, NY;
Huntsville Hospital, Huntsville, AL;
Hurley Medical Center, Flint, MI;
Idaho Caring Foundation, Inc., Boise, ID;
Advanced Clinical Simulation Laboratory, Idaho State University, Pocatello, ID;
Illinois Masonic Medical Center, Chicago, IL;
Illinois Primary Health Care Association, Springfield, IL;
India Community Center, Milpitas, CA;
School of Nursing, Indiana University Bloomington, IN;
Northwest Indiana Health Research Institute, Indiana University School of Medicine, Gary, IN;
Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, IN;
School of Nursing, Indiana University Southeast, New Albany, IN;
Inland Behavioral Health Services, Inc., San Bernardino, CA;
Institute for Family Health, New Paltz, NY;
Institute for Research and Rehabilitation, Houston, TX;
INTEGRIS Health, Oklahoma City, OK;
Intermountain Healthcare, Salt Lake City, UT;
Jameson Hospital, New Castle, PA;
Jasper Memorial Hospital, Monticello, GA;
Jefferson Regional Medical Center Nursing School, Pine Bluff, AR;
Jenkins County GA;
Hospital, Millen, GA;
Bell Gardens Health Center, John Wesley Community Health Institute, Bell Gardens, CA;
Johnson Memorial Hospital, Stafford Springs, CT;
Johnston Memorial Hospital, Smithfield, NC;
Kalamazoo Valley Community College, Kalamazoo, MI;
International Center for Spinal Cord Injury facility, Kennedy Krieger Institute, Baltimore, MD;
Kent State University Stark Campus, Health Building, North Canton, OH;
Kent State University, Health and Science Building, Ashtabula, OH;
Kilmichael Hospital, Kilmichael, MS;
Kirkwood Community College, Advanced Medical Simulation Instructional Center, Cedar Rapids, IA;
Knox Community Hospital, Mount Vernon, OH;
San Antonio Neighborhood Health Center, La Clinic de la Raza, Oakland, CA;
La Rabida Children's Hospital, Chicago, IL;
Lakeland Community College, Regional Healthcare Workforce Development Project, Kirtland, OH;
Community and University Partnership Service, Lamar University, Beaumont, TX;
Lanai Women's Center, Lanai City, HI;
Laurens County Health Care System, Clinton, SC;
Lawrence Hospital Center, Bronxville, NY;
League Against Cancer, Miami, FL;
Liberty County, medical offices, FL;
Bristol, FL;
Liberty Regional Medical Center, Hinesville, GA;
Limestone Community Care, Inc. Medical Clinic, Elkmont, AL;
Lincoln Community Health Center, Durham, NC;
Lincoln Medical and Mental Health Center, Bronx, NY;
Lodi Memorial Hospital, Lodi, CA;
Loretto in Syracuse, elderly health care facilities, Syracuse, NY;
Los Angeles Orthopaedic Hospital, Los Angeles, CA;
Louisville Metro Department of Public Works, Louisville, KY;
Lourdes Medical Center of Burlington County, Willingboro, NJ;
Loyola University Health System, Maywood, IL;
Lucile Packard Children's Hospital, Palo Alto, CA;
Madison Center, South Bend, IN;
Madison County Memorial Hospital, Rexburg, ID;
Madison County, Nursing Homes, Virginia City, MT;
Madison St. Joseph Health Center, Madisonville, TX;
Maine Center for Marine Biotechnology, Gulf of Maine Research Institute, Portland, ME;
Maine Primary Care Association, Augusta, ME;
Manchester Memorial Hospital, Manchester, CT;
Marana Health Center, Marana, AZ;
Marias Medical Center, Shelby, MT;
Marquette General Hospital, Marquette, MI;
Marshalltown Medical and Surgical Center, Marshalltown, IA;
Mary Scott Nursing Center, Dayton, OH;
Maryland State Dental Association, Columbia, MD;
Center for Science and Health Professions, Maryville University, St. Louis, MO;
Mason County Board of Health, Maysville, KY;
Massachusetts College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences, Worcester, MA;
Maury Regional Hospital, Columbia, TN;
Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN;
Memorial Hermann Baptist Beaumont Hospital, Beaumont, TX;
Memorial Hermann Healthcare System, Houston, TX;
Memorial Hermann Southwest Hospital, Houston, TX;
Mendocino Coast District Hospital, Fort Bragg, CA;
Family Wellness Center, Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin, Keshena, WI;
Mercy College of Northwest Ohio, Professional Education Division, Toledo, OH;
Mercy Health Foundation, Durango, CO;
Mercy Hospital Grayling, Grayting, MI;
Mercy Hospital, Buffalo, NY;
Mercy Medical Center, Redding, CA;
Mercy Medical Center—House of Mercy, Des Moines, IA;
Mercy Memorial Hospital, Monroe, MI;
Mercy Ministries Health Center, Laredo, TX;
Mercy Suburban Hospital, Norristown, PA;
Methodist Hospital of Southern California, Arcadia, CA;
Methodist Hospital, Houston, TX;
Metropolitan Hospital, New York, NY;
Metro West Medical Center Framingham Union Hospital, Framingham, MA;
Miami Beach Community Health Center, Miami Beach, FL;
Middle Tennessee State University, Center for Physical Activity, Murfreesboro, TN;
Middlesex Community College, Health Education Programs, Lowell, MA;
Middletown Regional Hospital, Middletown, OH;
Mid-Ohio FoodBank, Columbus, OH;
Miles Community College, Pathways to Careers in Healthcare, Miles City, MT;
Mission Hospitals, Asheville, NC;
Missouri Delta Medical Center, Sikeston, MO;
Monroe Clinic, Monroe, WI;
Monroe County Hospital, Forsyth, GA;

Montefiore Medical Center, Bronx, NY;
Montgomery Area Nontraditional Equestrians, Pike Road, AL;
Morehead State University, Healthy Communities Outreach and Demonstration, Morehead, KY;
Morris Heights Health Center, Inc., Bronx, NY;
Morton Hospital and Medical Center, Taunton, MA;
Mount Nittany Medical Center, State College, PA;
Mount Vernon Hospital, Mount Vernon, NY;
Mount Wachusett Community College, Northern Tier Healthcare Simulated Instructional Mannequin System (SIMS), Gardner, MA;
Muhlenberg Community Hospital, Greenville, KY;
Naugatuck Valley Community College, Nursing Program, Waterbury, CT;
Nebraska Hospital Association Research and Education Foundation, Lincoln, NE;
New York College of Osteopathic Medicine, Old Westbury, NY;
New York Presbyterian Hospital, New York, NY;
Newark Beth Israel Medical Center, Newark, NJ;
Newark-Wayne Community Hospital, Newark, NY;
Newport Hospital Newport, RI;
Newton Memorial Hospital, Newton, NJ;
Niagara Falls Memorial Medical Center, Niagara Falls, NY;
Norman Regional Health System, Norman, OK;
NorthEast Ohio Neighborhood Health Services, Inc., Cleveland, OH;
Northeast Wisconsin Technical College, Green Bay, WI;
Northern Dutchess Hospital Rhinebeck, NY;
Northern Westchester Hospital, Mount Kisco, NY;
Northland Medical Center, Princeton, MN;
Northwest Community Health Care, Pascoag, RI;
Northwest Hospital Intermediate Care Unit, Randallstown, MD;
Northwest Kidney Centers, Seattle, WA;
Northwest Nazarene University, Nursing Facility, Nampa, ID;
Northwestern Memorial Hospital, Chicago, IL;
Oakland University School of Nursing, Rochester, MI;
Oaklawn Adult Group Home, Goshen, IN;
Oakwood Healthcare System Foundation, Dearborn. MI;
Ocean Beach Hospital, Ilwaco, WA;
James Cancer Survivorship Center, Ohio State University Comprehensive Cancer Center, Columbus, OH;
Ohio State University Medical Center, Columbus, OH;
Oklahoma University College of Medicine—Tulsa, Tulsa, OK;
Olympic Community Action Program, Port Angeles, WA;
Oregon Coast Community College, Nursing Program, Newport, OR;
Osceola County Health Department, Poinciana, FL;
Osceola Medical Center, Osceola, WI;
Our Lady of Lourdes Memorial Hospital, Binghamton, NY;
Palisades Medical Center, North Bergen, NJ;
Palmetto Health Foundation, Columbia, SC;
Parkland Health Center, Farmington, MO;
Passavant Area Hospital, Jacksonville, IL;
Pattie A. Clay Regional Medical Center, Richmond, KY;
Pee Dee Healthy Start, Florence, SC;
Peninsula Hospital Center, New York, NY;
People, Inc., Williamsville, NY;
Highland Hospital, Peralta Community College, Oakland, CA;
Person Memorial Hospital, Roxboro, NC;
Phoenix Children's Hospital, Phoenix, AZ;
Children's Health Center/Emergency Shelter, Placer County, Auburn, CA;
Pointe Coupee Better Access Community Health, New Roads, LA;
Ponce Center of Autism, Municipality of Ponce, PR;
Powell County Medical Center, Deer Lodge, MT;
Powell Valley Health Care, Powell, WY;
Prairie Star Health Center, Hutchinson, KS;
Preston Memorial Hospital, Kingwood, WV;
Project Access Spokane, Spokane, WA;
ProMedica Continuing Care Service Corporation, Adrian, MI;
Provena Saint Joseph Hospital, Elgin, IL;
Providence Health System, Anchorage, AK;
Putnam Hospital Center, Carmel, NY;
Quebrada Health Center, Municipality of Camuy, PR;
Quincy Valley Medical Center, Quincy, WA;
Rancho Santiago Community College District, Public-Private Medical Education Complex, Santa Ana, CA;
Reading Hospital School of Nursing, West Reading, PA;
Reformed Presbyterian Women's Association, Pittsburgh, PA;
Regional Children's Hospital, Johnson City, TN;
Rhode Island Quality Institute, Providence, RI;
Health Commons, Rio Arriba County, Espanola, NM;
Riverside County Regional Medical Center, Moreno Valley, CA;
Riverside Health System, Newport News, VA;
Roosevelt Hospital, New York, NY;
Rosebud Sioux Tribe, Rosebud, SD;
Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Buffalo, NY;
Rural Health Technology Consortium;
Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, IL;
Saginaw Valley State University, University Center, MI;
Saint Mary's Health Care, Grand Rapids, MI;
Sam Rogers Health Clinic, Kansas City, MO;
San Antonio Hospital Foundation, Upland, CA;
San Francisco Medical Center Outpatient Improvement Programs, Inc., San Francisco, CA;
San Mateo Medical Center Emergency Department, San Mateo County, Redwood City, CA;
San Ysidro Health Center, San Ysidro, CA;
Sandoval County, Telemedicine Project, Bernalillo, NM;
Santa Rosa Memorial Hospital, Orange, CA;
Schneck Medical Center, Seymour, IN;
Scotland Memorial Hospital, Laurinburg, NC;
Seattle Cancer Care Alliance, Seattle, WA;
Sharp Rehabilitation Services, San Diego, CA;
Shasta Community Health Center, Redding, CA;
Shawano County Rural Health Initiative, Shawano, WI;
Sidney Health Center, Sidney, MT;
Sierra Nevada Memorial Foundation, Grass Valley, CA;
Sistersville General Hospital, Sisterville, WV;
Skagit Valley Hospital Cancer Care Center, Mount Vernon, WA;
Soldiers and Sailors Memorial Hospital, Wellsboro, PA;
Somerset Medical Center, Somerville, NJ;
South Broward Hospital District, Hollywood, FL;
South Carolina HIV/AIDS Council, Columbia, SC;
South Nassau Communities Hospital, Oceanside, NY;
South Shore Hospital, South Weymouth, MA;
Southampton Hospital, Southampton, NY;
Southeast Alabama Medical Center, Dothan, AL;
Southeast Community College, Allied health training center, Cumberland, KY;
Southeast Missouri State University, Economic Workforce and Development program, Cape Girardeau, MO;
Southern Methodist University, Southwestern Consortium for Anti-Infective and Virological Research, Dallas, TX;
Southern Vermont Recreation Center Foundation, Springfield, VT;
Southwest Tennessee Community College, Nursing and Biotechnology Program, Memphis, TN;
St James Hospital and Health Centers, Chicago Heights, IL;
St. Agnes Hospital, Fresno, CA;
St. Ambrose University, Davenport, IA;
St. Anthony Community Hospital, Warwick, NY;
St. Anthony Hospital, Chicago, IL;
St. Anthony Memorial Health Centers, Hammond, IN;
St. Bernard Health Center, Inc., Chalmette, LA;
St. Bernardine Medical Center, San Bernardino, CA;
St. Camillus Health and Rehabilitation Center, Syracuse, NY;
St. Catharine College, Allied Health and Sciences Education Project, St. Catharine, KY;
St. Charles Parish, LaPlace, LA;
St. Clair Hospital, Pittsburgh, PA;
St. Claire Regional Medical Center, Morehead, KY;
St. Elizabeth Medical Center, Utica, NY;
St. Francis Hospital, Escanaba, MI;
St. Francis Medical Center, Trenton, NJ;
St. James Parish Hospital, Lutcher, LA;
St. John's North Shore Hospital, Harrison Township, MI;
St. Joseph of the Pines, Southern Pines, NC;
St. Joseph Regional Medical Center, South Bend, IN;
St. Joseph's Hospital Mercy Care Services, Atlanta, GA;
St. Joseph's Hospital, Buckhannon, WV;
St. Joseph's Hospital, Savannah, GA;
St. Joseph's Regional Medical Center, Paterson, NJ;
St. Joseph's/Candler Health System, Savannah, GA;
St. Luke's Quakertown Hospital, Quakertown, PA;
St. Luke's Regional Medical Center, Ltd., Boise, ID;
St. Mary Medical Center Foundation, Langhorne, PA;
St. Mary Medical Center, Apple Valley, CA;
St. Mary's Hospital Foundation, Grand Junction, CO;
St. Mary's Hospital, Madison, WI;
St. Mary's Medical Center, Huntington, WV;
St. Mary's Regional Medical Center, Reno, NY;
St. Patrick Hospital and Health Sciences Center, Missoula, MT;
St. Peter's Hospital Foundation, Albany, NY;
St. Petersburg College, Orthotics and Prosthetics building, St. Petersburg, FL;

St. Vincent Hospital, Billings, MT;
St. Vincent's Charity Hospital, Cleveland, OH;
St. Vincent's Medical Center, Bridgeport, CT;
St. Xavier University, Chicago, IL;
Stamford Hospital, Stamford, CT;
Stark Prescription Assistance Network, Canton, OH;
State Fair Community College, Science and Allied Health Center, Sedalia, MO;
Stewart-Marchman Center, Inc., Daytona Beach, FL;
Stony Point Ambulance Corps, Stony Point, NY;
Appalachian Regional Healthcare Hospital, Summers County Commission, Hinton, WV;
Swedish Covenant Hospital, Chicago, IL;
Sylvan Grove Hospital, Jackson, MS;
Tangipahoa Parish, Loranger, LA;
Rural Nursing Education Program, Tarleton State University, Stephenville, TX;
Tarrant County Infant Mortality Task Force, Ft. Worth, TX;
Taylor Regional Hospital, Hawkinsville, GA;
Temple Health and Bioscience Economic Development District, Temple, TX;
Teton Valley Hospital and Surgicenter, Driggs, ID;
Texas A&M University—Kingsville, Animal Research Facility, Kingsville, TX;
Texas Institute for Genomic Medicine, College Station, TX;
Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center, El Paso and Lubbock, TX;
Thomas Jefferson University Breast Cancer Center, Philadelphia, PA;
Thomason General Hospital, El Paso, TX;
Thundermist Health Center, Woonsocket, RI;
Tohono O'odham Nation, Sells, AZ;
Toledo Children's Hospital, Toledo, OH;
Tomorrow's Child/Michigan SIDS, Lansing, MI;
Senior Citizens' Center for Health and Wellness, Town of Argo, AL;
Translational Genomics Research Institute, Phoenix, AZ;
Transylvania Community Hospital, Inc., Brevard, NC;
Tulare District Hospital, Tulare, CA;
Tuomey Healthcare System, Sumter, SC;
Twin City Hospital, Dennison, OH;
Union Hospital, Terre Haute, IN;
Uniontown Hospital, Uniontown, PA;
Unity Health Care, Washington, DC;
University Community Hospital/Pepin Heart Hospital, Tampa, FL;
University Health System, San Antonio, TX;
University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL;
University of Arizona Medical Center, Tucson, AZ;
University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, Little Rock, AR;
Antenatal and Neonatal Guidelines, Education, and Learning System, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, Little Rock, AR;
University of Arkansas Medical School Cancer Research Center, Little Rock, AR;
Center for Education, University of California, Davis Health System, Sacramento, CA;
University of Chicago Hospitals, Chicago, IL;
University of Illinois College of Medicine, Peoria, IL;
Public health research and education building, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA;
Advanced biomedical research institute, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA;
University of Kansas Research Center, Lawrence, KS;
University of Massachusetts Memorial Medical Center, Worcester, MA;
University of Memphis, Health Building, Memphis, TN;
Center for Research in Medical Education, University of Miami, Miami, FL;
C.S. Mott Children's and Women's Hospitals, University of Michigan Health System, Ann Arbor, MI;
University of North Alabama, Science and Health Facility, Florence, AL;
Center for Computational Epidemiology, University of North Texas, Denton, TX;
National Center for Nursing Education, University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, CO;
University of South Florida, Cancer Clinical Trials Project, Tampa, FL;
University of Tennessee of Chattanooga, Chattanooga, Low Birth Weight Study Project, TN;
University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, TX;
University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, TX;
University of Virginia Health System, Charlottesville, VA;
University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, Living Healthy Community Clinic, Oshkosh, WI;
Utah Navajo Health System, Inc., Montezuma Creek, UT;
Valley Cooperative Health Care, Hudson, WI;
Vanguard University Nursing Center, Costa Mesa, CA;
Village Network Boys' Village Campus, Wooster, OH;
Virtua Memorial Hospital Burlington County, Mount Holly, NJ;
Visiting Nurse Association Healthcare Partners of Ohio, Cleveland, OH;
Wadsworth Rittman Hospital Foundation, Wadsworth, OH;
Holly Hill Hospital, Wake County, Raleigh, NC;
Washington County, GA Regional Medical Center, Sandersville, GA;
Washington Hospital Center, Washington, DC;
Washington Parish, Bogalusa, LA;
Wayne Memorial Hospital. Jesup, GA;
West Jefferson Medical Center, Marrero, LA;
West Shore Medical Center, Manistee, MI;
West Side Community Health Services, St. Paul, MN;
West Virginia University Hospital, Morgantown, WV;
Western North Carolina Health System, Asheville, NC;
Whidden Memorial Hospital, Everett, MA;
White County Memorial Hospital, Monticello, IN;
White Memorial Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA;
White Plains Hospital Center, White Plains, NY;
Whiteside County Department of Health, Rock Falls, IL;
Whittemore Peterson Institute for Neuro-Immune Disease, Sparks, NV;
Wind River Community Health Center, Riverton, WY;
Wing Memorial Hospital, Palmer, MA Winneshiek Medical Center, Decorah, IA;
Wolfson Children's Hospital, Jacksonville, FL;
Woodhull Medical and Mental Health Center, Brooklyn, NY;
Woodruff County Nursing Home, McCrory, AR;
Wyoming County Community Hospital, Warsaw, NY;
YMCA of Central Stark County, Canton, OH;
York Memorial Hospital, York, PA;
Youth Crisis Center, Jacksonville, FL;
Zucker Hillside Hospital, Glen Oaks, NY;
Alma Family Services, Monterey Park, CA;
Bronx-Lebanon Hospital, New York, NY;
Community Health Partnership, Santa Clara, CA;
Hunterdon Medical Center, Flemington, NJ;
Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center, Shreveport, LA;
Marymount University, Nurse Managed Health Center, Arlington, VA;
Nassau University Medical Centers, East Meadow, NY;
National Hispanic Medical Association, Washington, DC;
Prince George's County, Health Insurance Media Campaign, Upper Marlboro, MD;
St. Luke's Community Free Clinic, Front Royal, VA;
Thurston-Mason County Medical Society, Olympia, WA;
Alabama Institute of the Deaf and Blind, Talladega, AL;
Albany State University, African American Male Initiative, Albany, GA;
American Speech-Language-Hearing Foundation, Rockville, MD;
Anne Arundel Community College, Center for Health, Science, and Homeland Security, Arnold, MD;
Armstrong Atlantic State University, Cyber Security Research Initiative, Savannah, GA;
Asnuntuck Community College, Manufacturing Technology Center, Enfield, CT;
Azusa Pacific University, School of Nursing, San Bernardino, CA;
Bellevue Community College, Building Safer Information Technology project, Bellevue, WA;
Beloit College, Science Building, Beloit, WI;
Engineering technology center, Bemidji State University, Bemidji, MN;
Bennett College for Women, Suspension Intervention Program, Greensboro, NC;
Berkshire Community College, Access to Education Initiative, Pittsfield, MA;
Bluegrass Community and Technical College, Technology Equipment, Winchester, KY;
Broward Community College, Minority Center for Preparedness and Prevention, Broward County, FL;
Bucknell University, Environmental Initiative, Lewisburg, PA;
Buena Vista University, post secondary education online curriculum, Storm Lake, IA;
Butler Community College, technological worker training program, Andover, KS;
Caldwell Community College and Technical Institute, County Teaching Center, Hudson, NC;
California Baptist University, School of Engineering, Riverside, CA;
California Polytechnic State University, Animal Research, San Luis Obispo, CA;
California State University—Channel Islands, Regional Clinical Simulation Technology Laboratory, Camarillo, CA;
Ruby Gerontology Center, California State University—Fullerton, Fullerton, CA;
Campbell University, Advancement for Underrepresented Minority Pharmacists and Pharmaceutical Scientists Program, Buies Creek, NC;
Central Arizona College, Bilingual Nursing Program, Coolidge, AZ;
Central Florida Community College, Equine Studies Curriculum, Ocala, FL;
Central Methodist University, Novel Partnership, Fayette, MO;
Center for Integrated Emergency Response Training, Central Piedmont Community College, Charlotte, NC;
Central Washington University, Wine Quality Testing and Education Initiative, Ellensburg, WA;
Chemeketa Community College, Health Sciences Education Center, Salem, OR;
Charles B. Rangel Center for Public Service, City College of New York, NY;

Clark State Community College, Green County Campus, Springfield, OH;

Clayton College and State University, archival graduate program, Morrow, GA;
Institute for Environmental Sustainability in the Workforce, Clover Park Technical College, Lakewood, WA;
College of Lake County, Family English as a Second Language Program, Grayslake, IL;
College of Southern Idaho, Pro-Tech Program, Twin Falls, ID;
College of Southern Maryland, Construction and Transportation Training, LaPlata, MD;
College of the Canyons, Medical Lab Technician Degree Program, Santa Clarita, CA;
College Success Foundation, Issaquah, WA;
Community College of Allegheny County, Technical Education, Pittsburgh, PA;
Community College of Beaver County, Aviation Sciences Center, Monaca, PA;
Consensus Organizing Center, San Diego, CA;
Coppin State University, School of Nursing, Baltimore, MD;
Darton College, Biomedical Technology Education, Albany, GA;
Delaware County Community College, Science, Engineering, and Technology Complex, Media, PA;
Jasper County Career Academy, Des Moines Area Community College, Des Moines, ID;
Digital Campus Initiative, DeSales University, Center Valley, PA;
Eastern Illinois University, Nursing Program, Charleston, IL;
Eastern Shore Community College Industrial Maintenance Program, Melfa, VA;
Eckerd College, educational technology initiative, St. Petersburg, FL;
Edison College, Nursing Program, Charlotte County Campus, Punta Gorda, FL;
El Camino College, Nursing Program, Torrance, CA;
Teacher Education Enhancement Program, Elmira College, Elmira, NY;
Florida Campus Compact, Tallahassee, FL;
Coastal Watershed Institute, Florida Gulf Coast University, Ft. Myers, FL;
Focus: HOPE, Detroit, MI;
Franklin Pierce College, Bachelor of Science Degree in Nursing Program Development, Rindge, NH;
Frontier Community College, utility lineman training program, Fairfield, IL;
Ft. Valley State University, Teacher Preparation and Research Center, Ft. Valley, GA;
Gadsden State Community College, fiber optic planning and development, Gadsden, AL;
Center for Advanced Manufacturing Competitiveness, Gateway Community and Technical College, Ft. Mitchell, KY;
Gateway Community College, advanced manufacturing center, New Haven, CT;
Gila County Community College, registered nurses program, Globe, AZ;
Grace College, Access to Education for All Program, Winona Lake, IN;
Greenfield Community College, art training and education, Greenfield, MA;
Harcum College, laboratory and teaching facilities, Bryn Mawr, PA;
Harrisburg Area Community College, health department equipment, Harrisburg, PA;
Harrisburg University of Science and Technology, Academic Development and Equipment, Harrisburg, PA;
Herkimer County Community College, Renovation of Science Laboratory, Herkimer, NY;
Hiwassee College, dental hygiene program, Madisonville, TN;
Holy Family University, Teaching with Technology for Nurses Initiative, Philadelphia, PA;
Huntington Junior College, Closed Captioning program, WV;
Huston-Tillotson University, math and science education initiative, Austin, TX;
Institute for Advanced Learning and Research, Danville, VA;
Ivy Tech Community College, equipment and curriculum, Evansville, IN;
Jackson State University, Osteopathic Medical School, Jackson, MS;
James Rumsey Technical Institute, Automotive Technology Martinsburg, WV;
Tuscarawas County campus, Kent State University, New Philadelphia, OH;
King's College, civic engagement and service learning, Wilkes-Barre, PA;
La Sierra University, Science Building, Riverside, CA;
Extension center, Susquehanna County, Lackawanna College, Scranton, PA;
Lake City Community College, Math Initiative, Lake City, FL;
Latino Institute, Inc., Newark, NJ;
National Great Rivers Research and Education Center, Lewis and Clark Community College, Godfrey, IL;
Lincoln College, training equipment and material, Lincoln, IL;
Lincoln Memorial University College of Osteopathic Medicine, Curriculum Development, Harrogate, TN;
Linn-Benton Community College, Science and Health Equipment, Albany, OR;
Lorain County Community College, Library and Community Resource Center, Elyria, OH;
Los Angeles Valley College, Solving the Math Achievement Gap Program, Valley Glen, CA;
Lyon College, emergency equipment, Batesville, AR;
MacMurray College, Technology Upgrades, Jacksonville, IL;
Madonna University, Curriculum Development and Disaster Relief, Livonia, MI;
Gateway Community College, Maricopa County Community College, Tempe, AZ;
Marymount Manhattan College, Minority Teacher Preparation, New York, NY;
Louisiana Academy for Innovative Teaching and Learning, McNeese State University, Lake Charles, LA;
Mesa Community College, Online Registered Nurses Recertification Program, Mesa, AZ;
Metropolitan State University, nursing education programs, St. Paul, MN;
Advanced Technology Center Midland College, Midland, TX;
Midwestern University Chicago College of Pharmacy, Downers Grove, IL;
Institute for Civic Leadership, Mills College, Oakland, CA;
Minnesota State Colleges and Universities, Office of the Chancellor, St. Paul, MN;
Mira Costa Community College District, Nursing Education, Oceanside, CA;
Marine technology center and estuarine education center, Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College, Gautier, MS;
Academic Support Center, Missouri State University-West Plains, West Plains, MO;
Monroe Community College, special needs preparedness training program, Rochester, NY;
Montgomery County Community College, Advanced Technologies Initiative, Blue Bell, PA;
Mount Ida College, Veterinary Technology Program, Newton, MA;
Veterinary Center, Murray State University, Hopkinsville, KY;
Nevada State College, Accelerated Nursing Program, Henderson, NY;
Jane Bancroft Cook Library, New College of Florida, Sarasota, FL;
Public Archaeology Laboratory, New College of Florida, Sarasota, FL;
Strategic Languages Resource Center, New College of Florida, Sarasota, FL;
New Hampshire Community Technical College-Manchester, Manchester, NH;
Niagara County Community College, Nursing Equipment, Sanborn, NY;
North Arkansas College, Center Campus (including the L.E. ''Gene'' Durand Conference and Workforce Development Center), Harrison, AR;
Center for Engineering Technologies, North Carolina Center for Engineering Technologies, Hickory, NC;
Center for Nanoscience Technology Training, North Dakota State College of Science, Wahpeton, ND;
College of Engineering and Engineering Technology, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, IL;
METS Center, Northern Kentucky University Research Foundation, Highland Heights, KY;
Northwest Shoals Community College, technology upgrades, Phil Campbell, AL;
Norwich University, Nursing Equipment and Technology, Northfield, VT;
Oakland Community College, International Education Programs, Bloomfield Hills, MI;
Oklahoma Panhandle State University, Water Testing Facility, Goodwell, OK;
Onondaga Community College, equipment and infrastructure upgrades, Syracuse, NY;
OGI School of Science and Engineering, Oregon Health and Science University, Portland, OR;
Owens Community College, First Responder Training Initiative, Toledo, OH;
Palm Beach Community College, technology enhancements, Lake Worth, FL;
Paula and Anthony Rich Center for the Study and Treatment of Autism, Youngstown, OH;
Philadelphia School District, CORE Philly Scholarship Program, Philadelphia, PA;
Center of Excellence for Homeland Security, Pierce College, Tacoma, WA;
Kansas Technology Center, Pittsburg State University, Pittsburg, KS;
Polk Community College, manufacturing and training programs, Winter Haven, FL;
Portland State University, Science Research Teaching, Portland, OR;
Prince George's Community College, Management Information Upgrade, Largo, MD;
Purchase College, State University of New York, Math and Science Programs, Purchase, NY;
Radford University, Medical Graduate School Feasibility Study, Radford, VA;
Rhode Island College, Portuguese and Lusophone Studies Program, Providence, RI;
Richard Stockton College of New Jersey, Curriculum Development, Pomona, NJ;
Richland Community College, Industrial Training Center, Decatur, IL;
Industrial Training Center, Richmond Community College, Hamlet, NC;
Rockford College, technology and telecommunications equipment, Rockford, IL;
Round Rock Higher Education Center, Round Rock, TX;
Rutgers University School of Law-Camden, NJ;
San Jacinto College, Healthcare Education and Training Initiative, Pasadena, TX;
Santa Clara University, Learning Commons and Library, Santa Clara, CA;
Seton Hall University, Life Science and Technology Center, South Orange, NJ;
Siena Heights University, Nursing Program, Adrian, MI;
Silver Lake College, Nursing Program, Manitowoc, WI;
Simpson College, Blank Performing Arts Center, Indianola, IA;
Sparks College, Close Captioning Program, Shelbyville, IL;

St. Bonaventure University, Science Equipment Program, St. Bonaventure, NY;
St. Clair County Community College, Water Quality Technology Program, Port Huron, MI;
St. Francis College, Science, Technology, Engineering and Math Initiative, Brooklyn, NY;
St. Petersburg College, Long Distance Learning Program, St. Petersburg, FL;
State University of New York at Potsdam, Teacher Training Initiative, Potsdam, NY;
Sweetwater Education Foundation, Chula Vista, CA;
Texas Chiropractic College, Pasadena, TX;
Texas State Technical College, Manufacturing Workforce Training, Waco, TX;
Center for the Study of Addiction and Recovery, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX;
Tohono O'odham Community College, math and science equipment and instruction materials, Sells, AZ;
Tri-County Community College, Cherokee Center for Applied Technology, Murphy, NC;
Trident Technical College, Nursing Curriculum, Charleston, SC;
Trinity University, Educator's Technology Teaching Laboratories, San Antonio, TX;
University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ;
Matsui Center for Politics and Public Service, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, CA;
University of Central Arkansas, technology training initiative, Conway, AR;
Lou Frey Institute of Politics, University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL;
College of Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL;
College of Pharmacy, University of Louisiana at Monroe, Monroe, LA;
University of Michigan Depression Center, Ann Arbor, MI;
Teacher Leadership Initiative for School Improvement, University of Montevallo, Montevallo, AL;
American Indian Language Policy Research and Teacher Training Center, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM;
Assistive technology center, University of North Carolina at Wilmington, Wilmington, NC;
University of North Florida, Virtual School Readiness Incubator, Jacksonville, FL;
University of Texas at Tyler, Keeping American Competitive: Consortium for Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM), Tyler, TX;
University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston, Galveston, TX;
University of Virginia Center for Politics, Charlottesville, VA;
University of Wisconsin-Marshfield, Marshfield, WI;
Utah Valley State College, Center for the Study of Ethics, Orem, UT;
Vanguard University Nursing Center, Costa Mesa, CA;
Waldorf College, science equipment and library resources, Forest City, IA;
Weber State University, Teaching Assistant Pathway to Teaching (TAPT) Program, Ogden, UT;
West Central Technical College, workforce development and technical training, Waco, GA;
West Chester University, Nursing Program Development, West Chester, PA;
Wisconsin Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, Madison, WI;
Wittenberg University, Teacher Training Initiative, Springfield OH;
York College City University of New York, York College Aviation Institute, Jamaica, NY;
Aerospace Museum of California Foundation, McClellan, CA;
Alabama School of Math and Science, Mobile, AL;
America's Black Holocaust Museum, Milwaukee, WI;
American Airpower Museum, Farmingdale, NY;
American Jazz Museum, Kansas City, MO;
American West Heritage Center, Wellsville, UT;
Anne Arundel County Trust for Preservation, Inc., Annapolis, MD;
Armory Center for the Arts, Pasadena, CA;
Bandera County, Bandera, TX;
Bellevue Arts Museum, Bellevue, WA;
Boyle County Public library, Danville, KY;
Burpee Museum, Rockford, IL;
Charlotte County, FL, Archival System, Port Charlotte, FL;
Children's Museum of Indianapolis, Indianapolis, IN;
Children's Museum of Los Angeles, Van Nuys, CA;
Cincinnati Museum Center, Cincinnati, OH;
City of Chino Hills, Chino Hills, CA;
College Park Aviation Museum, College Park, MD;
Connecticut Historical Society Museum, Hartford, CT;
Juvenile Hall Library, Contra Costa County, Martinez, CA;
Corporation for Jefferson's Poplar Forest, Forest, VA;
County of San Bernardino, San Bernardino, CA;
Discovery Center of Idaho, Boise, ID;
Everson Museum of Art of Syracuse, Syracuse, NY;
Florida Holocaust Museum, St. Petersburg, FL;
Florida Southern College, Frank Lloyd Wright Preservation Achieve Wing, Lakeland, FL;
George and Eleanor McGovern Library, Dakota Wesleyan University, Mitchell, SD;
George C. Marshall Foundation, Lexington, VA;
George Washington University, Eleanor Roosevelt Papers Project, Washington, DC;
Heard Museum, Phoenix, AZ;
Heckscher Museum of Art, Huntington, NY;
Historic Hudson Valley, Tarrytown, NY;
History Museum of East Ottertail County, Perham, MN;
Impression 5 Science Center, Lansing, MI;
Lola Public Library, Lola, KS;
James A. Michener Art Museum, Doylestown, PA;
Jefferson Barracks Heritage Foundation Museum St. Louis, MO;
Kansas Regional Prisons Museum, Lansing, KS;
Massie Heritage Center, Savannah, GA;
Metropolitan Library System, Chicago, IL;
Monterey Bay Aquarium, Monterey, CA;
Morris Museum, Morristown, NJ;
Museum of Aviation Foundation, Warner Robins, GA;
Museum of Science and Technology, Syracuse, NY;
Onondaga County Public Library, Syracuse, NY;
Overton County Library, Livingston, TN;
Pennsylvania State Police Historical, Educational and Memorial Museum, Hershey, PA;
Pico Rivera Library, Pico Rivera, CA;
Portfolio Gallery and Education Center, St. Louis, MO;
Ralph Mark Gilbert Civil Rights Museum, Savannah, GA;
Rust College, Archival Equipment, Holly Springs, MS;
Samuel Dorsky Museum of Art, State University of New York at New Paltz, NY;
San Gabriel Library, San Gabriel, CA;
Shedd Aquarium, Chicago, IL;
South Carolina Aquarium, Charleston, SC;
South Florida Science Museum, West Palm Beach, FL;
Texas Tech University, Virtual Vietnam Achieve, Lubbock, TX;

Tubman African American Museum, Macon, GA;
Twin Cities Public Television, St. Paul, MN;
James R. Slater Museum of Natural History, University of Puget Sound, Tacoma, WA;
Yolo County Library, Woodland, CA;
Young At Art Children's Museum, Davie, FL;
Advocating Change Together, Inc. St. Paul, MN;
City of North Miami Beach, FL, North Miami Beach, FL;
Jewish Vocational and Career Counseling Service, San Francisco, CA;
Vocational Guidance Services, Cleveland, OH;
Access Community Health Center, Bloomingdale, IL;
Advocate Health Care, Oak Brook, IL;
Alfred University, Powell Institute for Children and Families, Alfred, NY;
American Red Cross, Lower Bucks County Chapter, Levittown, PA;
City and County of San Francisco Department of Public Health, San Francisco, CA;
City of Los Angeles, supportive housing services, CA;
Community Rehabilitation Center, Inc., Jacksonville, FL;
Family Services of Greater Waterbury, Waterbury, CT;
Family Support Systems Unlimited, Inc., Bronx, NY;
Fulton County Department of Mental Health, Atlanta, GA;
Heartland Health Outreach, Inc., Chicago, IL;
Helen Wheeler Center for Community Mental Health, Kankakee, IL;
Holy Spirit Hospital, Camp Hill, PA;
Institute of Training in Addiction Studies, Indiana Wesleyan University, Marion, IN;
Jewish Association for Residential Care, Farmington Hills, MI;
Kids Hope United, Waukegan, IL;
New Image Homeless Shelter, Los Angeles, CA;
Pacific Clinics, Arcadia, CA;
Prime Time House, Inc., Torrington, CT;
Ruth Rales Jewish Family Service, Boca Raton, FL;
Ventura County Probation Office, Ventura, CA;
Ventura County Sheriffs Department, Thousand Oaks, CA;
Adoption and trauma resource center, Youthville, Wichita, KS;
Community Foundation for Greater New Haven, New Haven, CT;
Fighting Back Partnership, Vallejo, CA;
Institute for the Advanced Study of Black Families, Oakland, CA;
Operation Safe House, Riverside, CA;
Partnership for a Drug-Free America, New York, NY;
Shiloh Economic Development Center, Bryan, TX;
South Boston Community Health Center, South Boston, MA;
YMCA of the East Bay, Richmond, CA;
City of Las Vegas, EVOLVE program, NV;
City of Oxford, Oxford, substance abuse treatment program, MS;
Fulton County government, Atlanta, Project Excell, CA;
Gavin Foundation, South Boston. MA;
Glide Foundation, San Francisco, CA;
Metro Homeless Youth Services of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA;
Minnesota Indian Women's Resource Center, Minneapolis, MN;
Nassau University Medical Center, East Meadow, NY;

Sandhills Teen Challenge, Carthage, NC;
Sheriffs Youth Program of Minnesota, Inver Grove Heights, MN;
Talbert House, Cincinnati, OH;
Trumbull County Lifelines, Warren, OH;
Union Station Foundation, Pasadena, CA;
United Way of Treasure Valley, Boise, ID;
Wayne County Academy, Alpha, KY;
WestCare Kentucky, Ashcamp, KY;

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 41: Page 58, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $8,000,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 42: Page 58, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 43: Page 58, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $32,700,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 44: Page 62, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $21,400,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 45: Page 77, lines 6 and 7, after each dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $99,000,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 46: Page 80, line 2, after each dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $272,250,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 47: Page 80, line 2, after each dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $33,907,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 48: Page 80, line 2, after each dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $7,596,000)''.

Page 80, lines 17, after each dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $7,596,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 49: Page 82, line 6 after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,695,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 50: Page 82, line 6 after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $23,533,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 51: Page 82, line 6 after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $14,731,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 52: Page 83, lines 14 and 15, after each dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $72,674,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 53: Page 90, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $11,785,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 54: Page 90, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $40,590,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 55: Page 97, line 16, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $255,625,000)''.

Page 97, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $255,625,000)''.

Page 98, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $55,000,000)''.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 56: Page 103, strike line 7 and all that follows through the comma on page 104, line 12.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 57: 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 Twin Cities Public Television, St. Paul, MN.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 58: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

None of funds made available in this Act for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention may be used for the Entertainment Education Program.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 59: 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 On Location Entertainment Industry Craft and Technician Training project, West Los Angeles College, Culver city, CA.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 60: 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 Read with Me/Lea Conmigo family literacy program, Families In Schools, Los Angeles, CA.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT NO. 61: 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 Andre Agassi College Preparatory Academy.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT NO. 62: 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 Charles B. Rangel Center for Public Service, City College of New York, NY.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT NO. 63: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 0.25 percent.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT NO. 64: Page 87, line 1, strike the comma and insert ''and''.

Page 87, line 3, strike ''and'' and all that follows through the first comma on line 5.

Page 87, line 5, after each dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $93,531,000)''.

Page 88, line 13, strike the colon and all that follows through page 89, line 3, and insert a period.

H.R. 3043

OFFERED BY: MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT NO. 65: Page 89, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $64,987,000)''.