some relief is forthcoming from the administration, as has been asked by the Governor of California, the Governor of Oregon, the delegations in the Senate, but nothing from the administration except obstruction and an economic disaster for these families from the coast.

NOAA FISHERIES RESPOND TOO SLOWLY TO DISASTER

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

Ms. HOOLEY. Last year, the fishing was reduced by about 60 percent. This year, the fishing along the Oregon and California coast has been reduced to almost nothing. In March, an administrator from NOAA told us they would be able to expedite a disaster by March of the 2006 season.

Well, it is way past March, folks. Yesterday we were told they will not be able to declare a disaster until February of 2007.

Let me tell you what happens: The people that cannot go out fishing cannot afford to make their payments on their boats. They cannot afford to feed their families. They cannot afford to put a roof over their heads. They can't afford school books for their children. This is a time when divorce rates go up; suicide rates go up.

These are not rich communities. These are poor communities. When disasters happen in other areas, we declare a disaster and help people out. That's what we do. This is unacceptable. We need everyone's help.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 27, nays 358, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 331]

YEAS—27

Ackerman
Berry
Capps
Clay
Conyers
DeFazio
Delahunt
Doggett
Emanuel
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Hastings (FL)
Kucinich
Lewis (GA)
McDermott
Miller, George
Pastor
Pelosi
Sánchez, Linda T.
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Towns
Waters
Waxman
Woolsey
Wu

NAYS—358

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Capito
Cardin
Carnahan
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Etheridge
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Otter
Pallone
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—47

Abercrombie
Boehlert
Bono
Cannon
Cantor
Capuano
Cardoza
Carson
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (FL)
Edwards
Engel
Evans
Fattah
Gingrey
Grijalva
Holden
Hyde
Istook
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Matsui
McCrery
McKinney
Melancon
Millender-McDonald
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Pascrell
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Poe
Pombo
Rangel
Sabo
Schakowsky
Sherwood
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Taylor (MS)
Watson
Young (AK)

□ 1108

Messrs. BUYER, MARCHANT, CLEAVER, COSTA, Mrs. MYRICK, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. EMANUEL, KUCINICH and Ms. ESHOO changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 331 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 890 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. 5672.

□ 1109

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. 5672) making appropriations for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday,

June 27, 2006, the amendment by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 25, line 22.

Pursuant to the order of the House of that day, no further amendment to the bill may be offered except those specified in the previous order of the House of that day, which is at the desk.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REYES

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REYES:

Page 23, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 24, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 62, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $10,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

The amendment before us would increase funding for the Southwest Border Prosecution Initiative, which is designed to reimburse prosecutors for the cost of prosecuting Federal drug crimes. As we all know, many federally initiated drug cases are referred to local courts for prosecution. These drug crimes are committed at U.S. ports of entry and communities along our U.S.-Mexico border.

This program has previously been funded at as much as $50 million to help alleviate the financial burden that the Federal Government was placing on local prosecutors in the 24 southwest border counties. The Department of Justice has expanded eligible jurisdictions to not only include 24 counties of the border but all 360 counties of all four border States: Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and California.

While the number of eligible jurisdictions has increased, annual appropriations have continued to decrease. The Fiscal Year 2006 Appropriations Act provided only $30 million for the program, which does not come close to meeting the existing needs. My amendment would add an additional $10 million, which would come closer to providing local governments with resources to carry out this Federal responsibility.

Last year, I received a letter from the District Attorney of El Paso, Texas, notifying me that he would cease to accept federally referred drug cases for State prosecution due to the excessive local financial burden that the lack of reimbursement was placing on the El Paso community. With help from the U.S. Attorney and our State senators, we were able to prevent this stoppage. If local prosecutors cease accepting these cases, many of these drug cases could not be adjudicated at all.

As we are all aware, the U.S.-Mexico border remains a main corridor for the entry of illegal drugs, and despite much success in interdiction and the prosecution efforts of many, harmful drugs continue to be a problem in our country. Our border counties and States are committed to providing assistance in prosecuting Federal drug cases, but Congress needs to be equally committed to funding this important program.

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

□ 1115

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman and ranking member for accepting this very vital and important amendment to our border communities, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. 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 CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES

For activities authorized by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–322), the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (''the 1968 Act''), the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–162), and the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act (Public Law 109–177) (including administrative costs), $570,545,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the funds under this heading, not to exceed $2,575,000 shall be available for the Office of Justice Programs for reimbursable services associated with programs administered by the Community Oriented Policing Services Office: *Provided further*, That any balances made available through prior year deobligations shall only be available in accordance with section 605 of this Act. Of the amount provided—

(1) $20,000,000 is for the matching grant program for armor vests for law enforcement officers, as authorized by section 2501 of part Y of the 1968 Act;

(2) $99,000,000 is for grants to address public safety and methamphetamine manufacturing, sale, and use in hot spots as authorized by section 754 of Public Law 109–177, including research on a methamphetamine vaccine;

(3) $100,000,000 is for law enforcement technologies and interoperable communications;

(4) $4,936,000 is for an offender re-entry program;

(5) $4,873,000 is for grants to upgrade criminal records, as authorized under the Crime Identification Technology Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 14601);

(6) $175,568,000 is for a DNA analysis and capacity enhancement program, and for other local, State, and Federal forensic activities, of which not less than $151,000,000 shall be for reducing and eliminating the backlog of DNA samples and for increasing State and local DNA laboratory capacity;

(7) $31,065,000 is for improving tribal law enforcement, including equipment and training;

(8) $54,808,000 is for Project Safe Neighborhoods, of which $40,000,000 is for a national program to reduce gang violence;

(9) $3,997,000 is for training and technical assistance;

(10) $49,348,000 is for the Office of Weed and Seed Strategies, as authorized by section 103 of the 1968 Act, as amended by section 1121 of Public Law 109–162; and

(11) not to exceed $26,950,000 is for program management and administration.

JUVENILE JUSTICE PROGRAMS

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (''the 1974 Act''), the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (''the 1968 Act''), the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–162), and other juvenile justice programs, including salaries and expenses in connection therewith to be transferred to and merged with the appropriations for Justice Assistance, $280,739,000, to remain available until expended as follows—

(1) $706,000 for concentration of Federal efforts, as authorized by section 204 of the 1974 Act;

(2) $75,000,000 for State and local programs authorized by section 221 of the 1974 Act, including training and technical assistance to assist small, non-profit organizations with the Federal grants process;

(3) $59,872,000 for demonstration projects, as authorized by sections 261 and 262 of the 1974 Act;

(4) $65,000,000 for delinquency prevention, as authorized by section 505 of the 1974 Act, of which—

(A) $10,000,000 shall be for the Tribal Youth Program;

(B) $20,000,000 shall be for a gang resistance education and training program; and

(C) $25,000,000 shall be for grants of $360,000 to each State and $6,640,000 shall be available for discretionary grants to States, for programs and activities to enforce State laws prohibiting the sale of alcoholic beverages to minors or the purchase or consumption of alcoholic beverages by minors, prevention and reduction of consumption of alcoholic beverages by minors, and for technical assistance and training;

(5) $992,000 for Project Childsafe;

(6) $14,808,000 for the Secure Our Schools Act, as authorized by part AA of the 1968 Act, as amended by section 1169 of Public Law 109–162;

(7) $15,000,000 for programs authorized by the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990; and

(8) $49,361,000 for the Juvenile Accountability Block Grants program as authorized by part R of the 1968 Act, as amended by section 1166 of Public Law 109–162 and Guam shall be considered a State:

Provided, That not more than 10 percent of each amount may be used for research, evaluation, and statistics activities designed to benefit the programs or activities authorized: *Provided further*, That not more than 2 percent of each amount may be used for training and technical assistance: *Provided further*, That the previous two provisos shall not apply to demonstration projects, as authorized by sections 261 and 262 of the 1974 Act: *Provided further*, That section 702(a) of Public Law 88–352 shall apply to any grants

for World Vision described in the report accompanying this Act and awarded by the Attorney General.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS BENEFITS

To remain available until expended, for payments authorized by part L of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796 et seq.) (''the 1968 Act''), such sums as are necessary, as authorized by section 6093 of Public Law 100–690 (102 Stat. 4339–4340); and $4,821,000, to remain available until expended for payments as authorized by section 1201(b) of the 1968 Act; and $4,007,000 for educational assistance, as authorized by subpart 2 of part L of title I of the 1968 Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent to return to that portion of the bill so he can offer his amendment?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Yes.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

Page 23, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 23, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 67, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, before I begin, let me commend Chairman WOLF and the ranking member as well for all of the hard work and energy that goes into this and the battle as well to bring this bill to the floor and to conclusion.

I come to the floor this morning to offer an amendment that, in essence, is very similar to one that I offered last year; and at that time the chairman gracefully accepted the amendment. My amendment simply seeks to take a small portion of the U.S. assessed contributions to the United Nations and give those funds to local law enforcement agencies, and it does that through the Byrne Memorial State Law Enforcement Assistance Grants Program, a program that has been talked about on this floor just last night.

Mr. Chairman, this is a program that is basically a partnership between the Federal Government, the State government and local communities, working together to create stronger and safer communities. It awards grants to States and local government entities so they can work together to create a strong criminal justice system, with emphasis on violent crime and serious offenders.

Mr. Chairman, since September 11, this grant program has also been utilized by local officials to boost their preparedness in case of terrorist attack. Living as I do in the Fifth District overlooking Ground Zero, the people in our area know about terrorism and the need to fight violent crime.

The total sum of this transfer is very small, only $2 million, and the United Nations' annual budget is almost $2 billion. This amounts to a fraction of 1 percent of the overall U.N. budget. It is my hope that this money will come directly from the United States contributions to the U.N.'s Information Center, which is based right here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, I see no reason whatsoever that U.S. tax dollars should be going to the U.N. to have the U.N. lobby this Congress. They are a bloated and overfunded agency as it is, and they should not be using our dollars to come and lobby us.

The stated purpose of this Information Center is to ''raise awareness about the organization's work and foster relations with the American public, U.S. Government officials and NGOs.''

Really? To foster relations?

Recently, a very highly publicized speech regarding the relationship between the United States and the U.N. was made by Deputy Secretary-General Mark Malloch Brown. In that speech, he chastised the American public and government officials such as us, saying we ''lack judgment and are unwittingly subject to manipulation by U.N. detractors.'' Then this very same U.N. Information Center took that speech and spread it around in a wide array of congressional and executive offices.

Again, I personally do not feel that the American public needs to be lectured by someone from an institution with the high rate of corruption and failed promises as the U.N. We should not be having our tax dollars go to an organization to attack us maliciously with false attacks. If the U.N. wants to repair its relationship with the U.S. Congress, it should spend less of its efforts and money on lobbying these Halls and more on cleaning up its own halls and operations.

Mr. Chairman, I will conclude at this point by reiterating how badly our law enforcement agencies need these funds and how aware we are of all the inefficiencies at the U.N. It was just yesterday with the Oil-for-Food Program that they were going through with the first prosecution in that matter. We are all familiar with the reform efforts that this House has tried to pass for the U.N., and the U.N. has blocked them at every count. We are all aware also that U.N. cannot even give us a definition of what genocide is, and we all know what is going on in Darfur. That is a genocide. Finally, we are all too aware that the U.N. cannot even give us a definition of what terrorism is.

Let me say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the law enforcement community and the citizens of the Fifth Congressional District who live in the shadows of 9/11 and Ground Zero, we are all too aware of what terrorism is, and we do not want our money to go to an organization such as the U.N. We would rather it go to fight terrorism.

Again, I thank the chairman for working with us on this legislation.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. We accept the amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent to return to that portion of the bill so he can offer his amendment?

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LYNCH:

Page 26, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $12,000,000)''.

Page 26, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $12,000,000)''.

Page 67, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $12,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

First of all, I would like to thank Chairman WOLF and also Ranking Member MOLLOHAN for accepting this amendment.

This amendment is being offered by myself and the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA). It basically restores $12 million to the Bulletproof

Vest Partnership Program and also reduces contributions to the International Organization funds within this bill by a corresponding amount.

Since the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Program's inception, over 11,500 jurisdictions have participated in purchasing over 450,000 bulletproof vests nationwide. Almost every congressional district across this Nation has benefited from this program. I know in Massachusetts alone law enforcement agencies have purchased over 34,000 vests since its inception.

Mr. Chairman, there is some urgency here on this matter because, unfortunately, it is estimated now that over 200,000 vests may need to be replaced that were previously issued due to the results of tests showing that a substance called Zylon has been used in previous vests and those have been shown to fail. So there is the need to get out and replace those vests that are now in service.

Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is that, according to President Tom Nee of the National Association of Police Organizations, almost 3,000 law enforcement officers have survived shootings thanks to bulletproof vests. We know that body armor can save lives. The problem is that many towns and cities in our districts and across the Nation are struggling with the costs. With budgetary constraints at the State and local levels, many communities are simply unable to purchase this life-saving equipment on their own.

With this program, by sharing that cost with the Federal Government, communities do have the opportunity to buy bulletproof vests for their law enforcement officers and thereby provide some protection for those in dangerous professions.

Mr. Chairman, Members on both sides of the aisle understand that our State and local law enforcement professionals should be fully equipped, and that is why I ask my colleagues in the House to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA).

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) for this bipartisan effort to help law enforcement.

We know the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program provides the necessary funding to protect local law enforcement officials. In my hometown of New York City, we received 10 percent of the money they spent on bulletproof vests over the last 2 years from the program, especially in Staten Island and Brooklyn, which I am proud to call home. We have probably more active and retired police officers than any other county in the country.

Mr. Chairman, we know full well, whether it is in Staten Island, Massachusetts or anywhere else in the country, that the line between this great country and anarchy is our police department. Even more devastating is when we hear from time to time, and it happens, when a police officer is shot and killed because he did not have the protection necessary.

Recently, we had an officer in New York City, Officer Dillon Stewart, shot during a high-speed chase. The bullet hit him just under his arm, just a fraction of an inch above his bulletproof vest, which eventually killed him. That is the horror, not only for the people who really appreciate the sacrifice of law enforcement, but for the Stewart family and so many others, who probably question if he just had a little more protection.

That is what this bulletproof vest program does. It allows cities like New York, Boston and all cities across the country to step up and get the resources to provide our law enforcement men and women with the tools they need. When we hear of a high-speed chase or we hear of a shooting, we can rest a little better knowing that we have done in Congress a good thing for them by giving them the protection that they deserve, expect and, frankly, need.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you in advance for accepting this amendment and giving the $12 million. I know you have a lot of difficult choices to make in this appropriations process, but in this case I think you are doing what is right for the American people and law enforcement.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. My father was a policeman in the City of Philadelphia for 20-some years, and I know how important this is.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from New York City (Mr. FOSSELLA). We accept the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

MOTION TO RISE OFFERED BY MR. GEORGE MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to rise.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 37, noes 352, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 332]

AYES—37

Capps
Capuano
Case
Clay
Conyers
Cummings
DeFazio
Doyle
Emanuel
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Hastings (FL)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Markey
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
Miller, George
Napolitano
Owens
Pastor
Pelosi
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Solis
Stark
Strickland
Thompson (CA)
Towns
Velázquez
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Woolsey
Wu

NOES—352

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Capito
Cardin
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Etheridge
Everett
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney

Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Otter
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Pearce
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—43

Abercrombie
Alexander
Calvert
Cannon
Cantor
Cardoza
Costa
Cubin
Davis (FL)
Edwards
Engel
Evans
Grijalva
Higgins
Holden
Hunter
Hyde
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kilpatrick (MI)
Marchant
Matsui
Miller (NC)
Murtha
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Payne
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Poe
Sabo
Sanders
Schwartz (PA)
Sherwood
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1159

Messrs. OTTER, NADLER, BARRETT of South Carolina, BOSWELL, RANGEL and WALSH changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to rise was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1200

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHIMKUS). The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

SEC. 101. In addition to amounts otherwise made available in this title for official reception and representation expenses, a total of not to exceed $60,000 from funds appropriated to the Department of Justice in this title shall be available to the Attorney General for official reception and representation expenses.

SEC. 102. None of the funds appropriated by this title shall be available to pay for an abortion, except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term, or in the case of rape: *Provided*, That should this prohibition be declared unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, this section shall be null and void.

SEC. 103. None of the funds appropriated under this title shall be used to require any person to perform, or facilitate in any way the performance of, any abortion.

SEC. 104. Nothing in the preceding section shall remove the obligation of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to provide escort services necessary for a female inmate to receive such service outside the Federal facility: *Provided*, That nothing in this section in any way diminishes the effect of section 103 intended to address the philosophical beliefs of individual employees of the Bureau of Prisons.

SEC. 105. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Department of Justice in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: *Provided*, That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

SEC. 106. The Attorney General is authorized to extend through September 30, 2008, the Personnel Management Demonstration Project transferred to the Attorney General pursuant to section 1115 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, Public Law 107–296 (6 U.S.C. 533) without limitation on the number of employees or the positions covered.

SEC. 107. None of the funds made available to the Department of Justice in this Act may be used for the purpose of transporting an individual who is a prisoner pursuant to conviction for crime under State or Federal law and is classified as a maximum or high security prisoner, other than to a prison or other facility certified by the Federal Bureau of Prisons as appropriately secure for housing such a prisoner.

SEC. 108. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used by Federal prisons to purchase cable television services, to rent or purchase videocassettes, videocassette recorders, or other audiovisual or electronic equipment used primarily for recreational purposes.

(b) The preceding sentence does not preclude the renting, maintenance, or purchase of audiovisual or electronic equipment for inmate training, religious, or educational programs.

SEC. 109. Any funds provided in this Act under ''Department of Justice'' used to implement E-Government Initiatives shall be subject to the procedures set forth in section 605 of this Act.

SEC. 110. None of the funds made available under this title shall be obligated or expended for SENTINEL, or for any other major new or enhanced information technology program having total estimated development costs in excess of $100,000,000, unless the Deputy Attorney General and the investment review board certify to the Committees on Appropriations that the information technology program has appropriate program management and contractor oversight mechanisms in place, and that the program is compatible with the enterprise architecture of the Department of Justice.

This title may be cited as the ''Department of Justice Appropriations Act, 2007''.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES

TRADE AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT

RELATED AGENCIES

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the United States Trade Representative, including the hire of passenger motor vehicles and the employment of experts and consultants as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $46,207,000, of which $1,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed $124,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That negotiations shall be conducted within the World Trade Organization consistent with the negotiating objectives contained in the Trade Act of 2002, Public Law 107–210: *Provided further*, That not less than $2,000,000 provided under this heading shall be for negotiating, implementing, monitoring, and enforcing trade agreements with China.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the International Trade Commission, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not to exceed $2,500 for official reception and representation expenses, $62,575,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses for international trade activities of the Department of Commerce provided for by law, and for engaging in trade promotional activities abroad, including expenses of grants and cooperative agreements for the purpose of promoting exports of United States firms, without regard to 44 U.S.C. 3702 and 3703; full medical coverage for dependent members of immediate families of employees stationed overseas and employees temporarily posted overseas; travel and transportation of employees of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service between two points abroad, without regard to 49 U.S.C. 40118; employment of Americans and aliens by contract for services; rental of space abroad for periods not exceeding 10 years, and expenses of alteration, repair, or improvement; purchase or construction of temporary demountable exhibition structures for use abroad; payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of 28 U.S.C. 2672 when such claims arise in foreign countries; not to exceed $327,000 for official representation expenses abroad; purchase of passenger motor vehicles for official use abroad, not to exceed $45,000 per vehicle; obtaining insurance on official motor vehicles; and rental of tie lines, $424,782,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008, of which $13,000,000 is to be derived from fees to be retained and used by the International Trade Administration, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302: *Provided*, That $47,328,000 shall be for Manufacturing and Services; $40,806,000 shall be for Market Access and Compliance; $61,367,000 shall be for the Import Administration of which not less than $3,000,000 is for the Office of China Compliance; $249,791,000 shall be for the United States and Foreign Commercial Service; and $25,490,000 shall be for Executive Direction and Administration: *Provided further*, That the provisions of the first sentence of section 105(f) and all of section 108(c) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2455(f) and 2458(c)) shall apply in carrying out these activities without regard to section 5412 of the Omnibus Trade

and Competitiveness Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 4912); and that for the purpose of this Act, contributions under the provisions of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 shall include payment for assessments for services provided as part of these activities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WOLF

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLF:

Page 36, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 62, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 62, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding and also for your cooperation in allowing this amendment.

I have two other amendments with much larger amounts that I wanted to shift into our United States Foreign Commercial Service and Trade Development Agency, but I am not going to offer those amendments. I have agreed to a smaller amount, some $5 million, which would come from the State Department's public diplomacy programs over at the State Department, again to promote United States business interests in international trade and through that administration in the Department of Commerce.

Yesterday, I think from the other side of the aisle, we took some $25 million from State and moved it into Legal Services. I can stand before you today, my colleagues, and say that probably nothing we do in this bill, as far as the Department of Commerce and our efforts to promote international trade and U.S. business and selling U.S. products abroad and creating jobs in the United States, is more important than this small shift of funds.

Today, we have a $724 billion trade deficit, and adding some $5 million to bolster our efforts and give us the tools and the resources we need to compete in these international markets and sell U.S. products abroad is so important. So that is what this amendment does.

And let me just commend Mr. WOLF, his staff, and the minority staff for the difficult task they have in moving these funds around in these very important projects. But this is a priority for me, it is a priority, I believe, for our Nation, and it is a priority for creating jobs and selling our products abroad.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF OHIO

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

Page 36, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert the following ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, when I was first elected to Congress in 1992, the United States trade deficit with the People's Republic of China for the whole year was $18 billion. This year, our trade deficit with China approached $18 billion by the end of January. By April, our year-to-date trade deficit with China topped $64 billion. At that pace, our trade deficit with China is growing 10 percent faster this year than last year, and last year's China trade deficit shattered all kinds of records by exceeding $201 billion.

It is not because China's companies are better than ours. It is not because people of China are smarter or more dedicated or more hardworking than American workers. We all know how China is able to do so well in the game of international trade: they cheat.

China's track record includes oppressive labor policies, currency manipulation, wholesale disregard for and theft of intellectual property, and dumping and counterfeiting of manufactured goods. These and other unfair China trade practices are a real source of concern for Members of Congress on this side of the aisle and some on that side of the aisle, and these practices are a real economic threat to the U.S. economy.

Believe me, I see the consequences all over Ohio in signs from Marietta to Toledo, from Youngstown to Hamilton; signs that read ''going out of business,'' ''everything must go,'' or just simply ''closed.'' Manufacturers in Ohio and all over the United States have closed their doors, have shipped jobs overseas because China refuses to compete fairly and because we haven't done enough to force China to play by the rules.

Chairman WOLF and Ranking Member MOLLOHAN understand the problem. I commend them for their work on this critical issue. Because of their leadership, the bill before us today specifically sets aside $3 million in International Trade Administration funding for the ITA's Office of China Compliance, which is responsible for monitoring imports from China and, importantly, initiating enforcement when it detects illegal dumping of Chinese goods.

My amendment builds on the foundation the committee has laid by increasing the set-aside for the Office of China Compliance from $3 million to $6 million.

American workers, American companies, especially small manufacturers, a machine shop in Akron or a tool and die maker in Dayton, these companies deserve a level playing field with China. Only with vigorous and well-funded trade monitoring and enforcement can we begin to provide that level playing field and allow U.S. manufacturers to compete.

My amendment improves funding for this critical work, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, our subcommittee created this office in 2004 after having a hearing. We have $3 million currently in the bill for China compliance. It is a very, very important issue.

We have also required there be a position in Beijing, and so I thank the gentleman for the amendment. We accept it.

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

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

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER 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 Ohio will be postponed.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise now because of the reference to China in the previous amendment. I had intended to give a 1-minute speech this morning on this issue, before I was cut off by a motion, but let me simply make an observation about China.

I am one of those Members of the House who wants the administration to track bank records and financial transactions of terrorist groups or individuals who are suspected of belonging to terrorist groups. That is why, while I had great misgivings about the original PATRIOT Act, I voted for it because I wanted to see a tightening up of our ability to go after those records. But I wanted it to be done in a legal fashion, in a way which guarantees the privacy and civil liberties of people who do not fall into that category.

I note the fact that there is a very strong similarity between the Communist Chinese Government and our own administration in one respect. I have two headlines in my hand here. One says, ''GOP Measure Slams New York Times for Bank Story.'' The other says, ''China May Fine News Media to Limit Coverage.''

I would simply note that the Chinese Government appears to have something more in common with our administration in addition to their desire to undercut American wages through trade agreements with slave and cheap labor coming out of China. I would note that both the Chinese Communist Government and our own administration appears to be interested in doing almost anything in order to prevent legitimate news organizations from reporting activities of the people who govern each country.

Now, I do not know the details of The New York Times revelations with respect to banking transactions, but I do know that the administration and some of their supporters in Congress have been extremely interested in embarrassing The New York Times since The New York Times uncovered a number of other activities that were being conducted by the administration which, in my judgment, are illegal, and those have nothing to do with the banking transactions that we saw referenced the other day.

□ 1215

So I just thought it might be of interest to note the similarity between these two headlines, one an administration from supposedly a democratic country and another a government from a communist country, both of whom seem to be eager to clamp down as much as possible on their journalistic critics. I would hope that those similarities would decline in the future.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF INDUSTRY AND SECURITY

OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses for export administration and national security activities of the Department of Commerce, including costs associated with the performance of export administration field activities both domestically and abroad; full medical coverage for dependent members of immediate families of employees stationed overseas; employment of Americans and aliens by contract for services abroad; payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of 28 U.S.C. 2672 when such claims arise in foreign countries; not to exceed $15,000 for official representation expenses abroad; awards of compensation to informers under the Export Administration Act of 1979, and as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 401(b); and purchase of passenger motor vehicles for official use and motor vehicles for law enforcement use with special requirement vehicles eligible for purchase without regard to any price limitation otherwise established by law, $76,806,000, to remain available until expended, of which $14,767,000 shall be for inspections and other activities related to national security: *Provided*, That the provisions of the first sentence of section 105(f) and all of section 108(c) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2455(f) and 2458(c)) shall apply in carrying out these activities: *Provided further*, That payments and contributions collected and accepted for materials or services provided as part of such activities may be retained for use in covering the cost of such activities, and for providing information to the public with respect to the export administration and national security activities of the Department of Commerce and other export control programs of the United States and other governments.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

For grants for economic development assistance as provided by the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, and for trade adjustment assistance, $230,741,000, to remain available until expended.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of administering the economic development assistance programs as provided for by law, $29,700,000: *Provided*, That these funds may be used to monitor projects approved pursuant to title I of the Public Works Employment Act of 1976, title II of the Trade Act of 1974, and the Community Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1977.

MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses of the Department of Commerce in fostering, promoting, and developing minority business enterprise, including expenses of grants, contracts, and other agreements with public or private organizations, $29,641,000.

ECONOMIC AND INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE

ECONOMIC AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by law, of economic and statistical analysis programs of the Department of Commerce, $79,880,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for collecting, compiling, analyzing, preparing, and publishing statistics, provided for by law, $190,067,000, of which $19,200,000 is for the Survey of Income and Program Participation.

PERIODIC CENSUSES AND PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses related to the 2010 decennial census, $511,767,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That of the total amount available related to the 2010 decennial census, $258,328,000 is for the Re-engineered Design Process for the Short-Form Only Census, $179,765,000 is for the American Community Survey, and $73,674,000 is for the Master Address File/Topologically Integrated Geographic Encoding and Referencing (MAF/TIGER) system.

In addition, for expenses to collect and publish statistics for other periodic censuses and programs provided for by law, $182,325,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008, of which $90,193,000 is for economic statistics programs and $92,132,000 is for demographic statistics programs: *Provided*, That regarding construction of a facility at the Suitland Federal Center, quarterly reports regarding the expenditure of funds and project planning, design and cost decisions shall be provided by the Bureau, in cooperation with the General Services Administration, to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this or any other Act under the heading ''Bureau of the Census, Periodic Censuses and Programs'' shall be used to fund the construction and tenant build-out costs of a facility at the Suitland Federal Center: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this or any other Act for any fiscal year may be used for the collection of Census data on race identification that does not include ''some other race'' as a category.

NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as provided for by law, of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), $17,837,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 1535(d), the Secretary of Commerce shall charge Federal agencies for costs incurred in spectrum management, analysis, and operations, and related services and such fees shall be retained and used as offsetting collections for costs of such spectrum services, to remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to retain and use as offsetting collections all funds transferred, or previously transferred, from other Government agencies for all costs incurred in telecommunications research, engineering, and related activities by the Institute for Telecommunication Sciences of NTIA, in furtherance of its assigned functions under this paragraph, and such funds received from other Government agencies shall remain available until expended.

PUBLIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES, PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION

For the administration of prior year grants, recoveries and unobligated balances of funds previously appropriated may be available for the administration of open grants.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Patent and Trademark Office provided for by law, including defense of suits instituted against the Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, $1,771,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced as offsetting collections assessed and collected pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1113 and 35 U.S.C. 41 and 376 are received during fiscal year 2007, so as to result in a fiscal year 2007 appropriation from the general fund estimated at $0: *Provided further*, That during fiscal year 2007, should the total amount of offsetting fee collections be less than $1,771,000,000, this amount shall be reduced accordingly: *Provided further*, That not less than 716 full-time equivalents, 745 positions and $90,532,000 shall be for the examination of trademark applications; and not less than 6,564 full-time equivalents, 6,920 positions and $1,084,025,000 shall be for the examination and searching of patent applications: *Provided further*, That not more than 311 full-time equivalents, 333 positions and $49,797,000 shall be for the Office of the General Counsel: *Provided further*, That not more than 95 full-time equivalents, 98 positions and $30,500,000 shall be for the Office of the Administrator for External Affairs: *Provided further*, That any deviation from the full-time equivalent, position, and funding designations set forth in the preceding four provisos shall be subject to the procedures set

forth in section 605 of this Act: *Provided further*, That from amounts provided herein, not to exceed $1,000 shall be made available in fiscal year 2007 for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 1353 of title 31, United States Code, no employee of the United States Patent and Trademark Office may accept payment or reimbursement from a non-Federal entity for travel, subsistence, or related expenses for the purpose of enabling an employee to attend and participate in a convention, conference, or meeting when the entity offering payment or reimbursement is a person or corporation subject to regulation by the Office, or represents a person or corporation subject to regulation by the Office, unless the person or corporation is an organization exempt from taxation pursuant to section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986: *Provided further*, That in fiscal year 2007, from the amounts made available for ''Salaries and Expenses'' for the United States Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), the amounts necessary to pay: (1) the difference between the percentage of basic pay contributed by the PTO and employees under section 8334(a) of title 5, United States Code, and the normal cost percentage (as defined by section 8331(17) of that title) of basic pay, of employees subject to subchapter III of chapter 83 of that title; and (2) the present value of the otherwise unfunded accruing costs, as determined by the Office of Personnel Management, of post-retirement life insurance and post-retirement health benefits coverage for all PTO employees, shall be transferred to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, the Employees Life Insurance Fund, and the Employees Health Benefits Fund, as appropriate, and shall be available for the authorized purposes of those accounts: *Provided further*, That sections 801, 802, and 803 of Division B, Public Law 108–447 shall remain in effect during fiscal year 2007.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Under Secretary for Technology, $2,000,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL RESEARCH AND SERVICES

For necessary expenses of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, $467,002,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $9,450,000 may be transferred to the ''Working Capital Fund''.

INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

For necessary expenses of the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, $92,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION OF RESEARCH FACILITIES

For construction of new research facilities, including architectural and engineering design, and for renovation and maintenance of existing facilities, not otherwise provided for the National Institute of Standards and Technology, as authorized by 15 U.S.C. 278c–278e, $67,998,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS, RESEARCH AND FACILITIES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of activities authorized by law for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, including maintenance, operation, and hire of aircraft and vessels; grants, contracts, or other payments to nonprofit organizations for the purposes of conducting activities pursuant to cooperative agreements; and relocation of facilities, $2,375,464,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That fees and donations received by the National Ocean Service for the management of national marine sanctuaries may be retained and used for the salaries and expenses associated with those activities, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302: *Provided further*, That in addition, $3,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the fund entitled ''Coastal Zone Management'' and in addition $77,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the fund entitled ''Promote and Develop Fishery Products and Research Pertaining to American Fisheries'': *Provided further*, That of the $2,466,464,000 provided for in direct obligations under this heading $2,375,464,000 is appropriated from the general fund, $80,000,000 is provided by transfer, and $11,000,000 is derived from recoveries of prior year obligations: *Provided further*, That no general administrative charge shall be applied against an assigned activity included in this Act or the report accompanying this Act: *Provided further*, That the total amount available for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration corporate services administrative support costs shall not exceed $183,775,000: *Provided further*, That payments of funds made available under this heading to the Department of Commerce Working Capital Fund including Department of Commerce General Counsel legal services shall not exceed $34,425,000: *Provided further*, That any deviation from the amounts designated for specific activities in the report accompanying this Act, or any use of deobligated balances of funds provided under this heading in previous years, shall be subject to the procedures set forth in section 605 of this Act: *Provided further*, That the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration may engage in formal and informal education activities, including primary and secondary education, related to the agency's mission goals.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. 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 Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

Page 46, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $2,700,000)''.

Page 50, line 21, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $2,700,000)''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would increase the appropriations for the National Weather Service by $2.7 million. The current appropriation for the weather service is at $882.3 million. My amendment would increase that amount to a total of $885 million, which I think was the original recommendation from the budget office. I want to thank my colleagues on the Science Committee for assisting me.

Mr. Chairman, in recent years, both in Texas and around the Nation, we have suffered catastrophic hurricanes. The Midwest is tormented by tornados, as well as Texas. The West lives with a threat of a doomsday scenario, earthquakes, tsunamis. So weather predictions are very, very important. We have determined that the weather predictions have saved lives. We have not been able to save materials, so much, but they have saved lives.

We all saw what happened with the hurricanes of Katrina and Rita. Although the National Weather Service did its job in accurately predicting the magnitude and the path of the storms, city, State and local Federal officials were slow to act. Traffic was snarled, and all of us know exactly what happened after that.

The good work of the National Weather Service is at the root of an effective natural disaster preparedness, and the .3 percent appropriations increase will strengthen support for the weather service to help it perform even better. We do not want to discourage them by cutting their budget when we need their services so accurately. The timely and accurate information provided by the National Weather Service is a testament to its effectiveness.

On the front page of the weather service's Web site is a map of America depicting current weather conditions, as well as storm watches and warnings. We can click on any region of the country and get instant access to weather and climate news for that area. The National Weather Service also pulls real-time information on flood warnings, and it collects hourly data on temperatures throughout the day.

There is a wonderful section on weather safety that provides sound guidance on issues such as heat, lightning, hurricanes, tornados, floods and even topics like FEMA and the Red Cross. In Dallas, we are sensitive to the issue of flooding. Downtown Dallas relies on an antiquated 30-mile levee system to keep it dry from the Trinity River and its floods.

It is getting worse because of extensive development in the counties west and north of the city. The 50-year-old levees may not be able to handle all the runoff that they were designed to contain. So this is extremely important for that area. The flooding that would take place as predicted in Dallas would flood all of downtown and all executive offices, hospitals, medical centers and what have you.

I feel this is a modest amount of money to place back with NOAA and the weather service, and it comes out of the general Department of Commerce administrative funds. I hope that I can get support.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. We accept the amendment.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER 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 gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GILCHREST

Mr. GILCHREST. 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. GILCHREST:

Page 46, line 11, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $441,000,000)''.

Page 47, line 7, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $89,000,000)''.

Page 48, line 7, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $253,000,000)''.

Page 55, line 21, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $783,000,000)''.

Page 55, line 23, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $783,000,000)''

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GILCHREST. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to make a comment on the chairman and the ranking member of this committee, that they have done a stunning job given the allocation.

What I would like to do with this amendment is to explain why it is important to take $738 million out of the space exploration program in NASA, that is the program that will send the man to the Moon and a man to Mars, and put that money into the National Ocean Service, the National Marine Fisheries Service and the Ocean Atmospheric Research Service of NOAA.

The Ocean Commission, commissioned by Congress, the members were appointed by the present President, Mr. Bush, recommended 200 items to be done with the world's oceans as ocean policy for the United States. They recommended that we put in $3.9 billion to implement those recommendations.

Well, we know that the budget is tight. The problem, though, is this particular appropriations bill provides for $300 million below the President's request for 2007, $300 million below the President's request, not even coming anywhere near, not even approaching the $3.9 billion. If you look at the budget for NOAA in 2005, we are, with this bill, with this budget, putting in $800 million less than the 2005 budget.

With the 200 recommendations to be implemented with the $3.9 billion that this commission recommended, we are attempting to resolve the issue of most of the world's largest fish, like you see here, 90 percent of their population is gone, 90 percent.

By the year 2050, the coral reefs that are healthy in the upper picture will look like the below picture. By the year 2050, we could have 60 percent of the coral reefs completely diminished. That doesn't even come close to the severe problems along U.S. coastal areas, the Gulf of Mexico, around Florida, the south Atlantic.

In this picture you see the dead zone, which is about a third of the area of the Chesapeake Bay. Our coastal areas are being depleted. I urge an ''aye'' vote on this amendment to take $738 million out of the manned space program to Mars and the Moon and put that amount of money into the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

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

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

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend Mr. GILCHREST for making a very powerful point with regard to the oceans. I refer Members to the newest issue of the National Geographic, The Health of the Coast. It validates so much of what Mr. GILCHREST has said. That is not the place to take it from, so I strongly oppose the amendment.

But I want to acknowledge that Mr. GILCHREST is right with regard to the oceans, and this administration and this Congress should be doing more in this regard. I think the gentleman understands that we can't take funding from there. I want to commend him and urge Members to validate what Mr. GILCHREST said with regard to the National Geographic.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I, too, want to commend my good friend from Maryland for his standing up for this important issue. I represent a coastal area, and certainly I would be willing to work with him as we move forward through the conference process.

This is obviously a very devastating amendment to NASA. I think this amendment would seriously jeopardize the plan to complete the International Space Station and jeopardize our obligations to the international partners.

We have entered into agreements with the Japanese and the Europeans to pursue completion of the space station. Obviously, it would also seriously jeopardize our plan to phase out the space shuttle and replace it with a crew exploration vehicle.

We are going to be getting into a phase in the early part of the next decade where we will not have a man-rated vehicle, where the Chinese will, and they plan to put people on the Moon. NASA is clearly a priority for this administration. It has been a priority for this Congress for years.

This amendment would cause personnel reductions. It would cause slippages in schedule.

I would strongly encourage all of my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I don't know if the gentleman from West Virginia would still seek to be recognized on this issue, but I would be very happy to yield time to my good friend from West Virginia on this very important topic.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I appreciate the gentleman yielding time. I rise in opposition to the amendment as well. Obviously, cuts of this kind in the science accounts anywhere in order to transfer money over to other science accounts is just robbing Peter to pay Paul. I think that illustrates where we are with the allocation that we have in this bill.

One of the real purposes of consolidating the science accounts into this subcommittee was to be able to look at science across the board and be able to fund it adequately. Well, it hasn't turned out to be that way, and this amendment is a great example of why. Here we are trying to take money from one science account and move it over to another science account.

I support the funding of the gentleman's amendment. I have to oppose the offset of the gentleman's amendment. In all of NASA's accounts, it was science that was hurt most.

□ 1230

Program after program after program, I don't have it at the moment to recite it, but the President has either eliminated or cut seriously science programs, one right after the other in the NASA account.

Well, we are very proud of increases to the National Science Foundation. Although we haven't met the authorization targets, we are very proud about increasing funding to the National Institutes of Health, and that has been funded very robustly over the last number of years.

But there are those science accounts and, particularly, NASA, a great science agency, that is not getting adequate funding now. That is about $500 million, I believe, short of where it should be.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I just wanted to give you some specifics. This is a tight budget year, as we all know. And just to cite one of the accounts that this amendment would obviously devastate, we have already reduced the lunar precursor robotics program by $20 million. There is a $16 million reduction in the constellation systems, $115 million reduction in the exploration systems research technology.

Total reduction already in this bill, $151 million from the President's request; and, obviously, a huge cut like this would devastate it further. So I would recommend a ''no'' vote on the Gilchrest amendment. But I applaud the gentleman for his passion on this issue.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, as a co-chair of the House Oceans Caucus, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Mr. GILCHREST to increase the base funding for NOAA.

Both the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy and the independent Pew Commission have called on Congress to increase NOAA's budget to more than $6 billion. Yet this bill funds NOAA at roughly half that, $3.4 billion, a cut of more than $500 million below last year.

Relative to their size and economic value, funding for ocean research and management pales in comparison to other natural resource programs, like management of public lands and space exploration. When we derive so much from our oceans, how can we invest so little in the understanding of them?

This amendment will allow us to better manage our fisheries, institute an integrated ocean observation system based on what we already have in the Gulf of Maine, and protect our coast from erosion and pollution. I urge support of the Gilchrest amendment.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure if I have any other speakers on the floor. I would simply say that, out of about approximately $16 billion that is spent on NASA and less than $4 billion spent on ocean issues, that is a pretty big disparity.

We need to spend the $16 billion on NASA, and probably a lot more. But, in my judgment, the Moon will be there for a long time. Mars will be there for a long time. And I don't want to take the money out of needed science programs, but the world's oceans are being degraded. They are being degraded in a number of ways by human activity that is not compatible with nature's design and the bulging population and acidic problems in the ocean. Because of burning of fossil fuel, the coastal areas are being inundated with our populations and being polluted. It is time that this country looked at this world, this Nation, and came up with a comprehensive, well-funded ocean program.

I want to thank the gentleman from Maine for speaking on behalf of this amendment. I want to thank the chairman for the time and his comments.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment.

NOAA is our lead ocean agency, overseeing programs to promote healthy oceans, coastal areas and communities. The U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy highlighted the need for new and sustained investments in ocean and coastal programs to meet our current and future challenges. Failing to make these investments will jeopardize the economic and ecological benefits our Nation receives from its oceans and coasts.

Although I understand difficult decisions must be made in the limited budget available for fiscal year 2007, H.R. 5672 would decimate funding for our coastal programs including cooperative fisheries research; coastal and estuarine land conservation; ocean exploration and undersea research; oil spill response and restoration; and our National Estuarine Research Reserves. These programs provide important, on-the-ground benefits to our coastal communities at relatively little Federal expense.

Cuts to our Coastal Zone Management Program in New Jersey would result in the elimination of their coastal hazards training program to assist our communities prepare and respond to hurricanes. They would also be forced to eliminate their Clean Marina program. These are just a few examples of what would be lost if this level of funding remains.

Our Nation has put 16 men on the surface of the Moon and only sent two to the bottom of the ocean. It is time we put Earth first—we can go to other planets later.

I urge my colleagues to support the Gilchrest amendment and restore NOAA funding to the fiscal year 2005 level.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the amendment offered by Congressman GILCHREST. While I fully support funding for NOAA, I stand opposed to efforts to reduce funding for NASA.

It is important to note that the bill reported out of the Appropriations committee already reduces funding for NASA by $151 million. If this amendment is accepted, it would further reduce NASA beyond the administration's request.

NASA is at a critical crossroads. Over the next few years, the agency must complete the International Space Station, retire the Space Shuttle, develop a new space vehicle, and maintain needed science and aeronautics programs. Further cuts to NASA will only deepen the gap in human space flight capability and force our nation to rely more heavily on international partners. At a time when the United States is concerned about global competitiveness, cutting NASA funding would send our country in the wrong direction.

Mr. Chairman, NASA is a good investment. Over the last 10 years, NASA's budget has decreased or remained flat while overall domestic spending grew substantially. Fully funding the space exploration vision represents only .7 percent of the Federal budget and yet this small investment yields large returns in health care, public safety, and telecommunications. Space exploration technologies have produced advanced semiconductors that power our businesses, materials employed by our military to keep our men and women safe, and software that aids our law enforcement personnel in fighting crime and detecting illegal drugs.

The Appropriations Committee has done a commendable job balancing our national needs with our budget realities. They have preserved vital funding for critical areas, including science initiatives, and I would urge the House to support the underlying bill and vote against efforts to cut NASA funding. Vote ''no'' on the Gilchrest amendment.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I recognize Chairman WOLF's hard work on the SSJC bill, H.R. 5672. However, as one of six co-chairs of the House Oceans Caucus, I was deeply concerned when I saw the degree to which NOAA was grossly under-funded, especially its wet programs within the National Ocean Service (NOS), National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), and Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (OAR). The reductions proposed in the bill are about 31 percent compared to FY06 and 36 percent compared to FY05 enacted levels, totaling about $783 million over the last 2 funding cycles. The House mark represents a major setback in protecting our Nation's ocean and coastal resources. Given that NOAA is the lead Federal agency for ocean-related management and activities, this void will not be filled elsewhere.

The direct and indirect impacts the oceans and coasts have on our lives and livelihoods are paramount. They are, by far, our greatest natural resource and the life support of our only planet. Yet, we fail to see the ocean for the waves when we cut more than half a billion dollars from the NOAA budget. Over half of the U.S. population lives in coastal states. Coastal and marine waters support over 2.8 million jobs and produce one-third of the nation's GDP. The culture, economy, and security of our Nation depend on the health and sustainability of these assets, yet we are not sufficiently managing and protecting them. Though the budget this year is more constrained than ever, the decision not to make ocean funding a priority will cost the U.S. economy more than $1 billion in direct losses, and even more indirectly. Instead, an increased and sustained investment now would enhance the benefits we reap in the future, a need highlighted by the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy (USCOP) in their 2004 report and by the Joint Ocean Commission Initiative in their recent list of ocean policy priorities for Congress.

Along those lines, I want to emphasize the invaluable services and programs of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the lead federal agency for ocean-related management and activities. Among these are the National Marine Sanctuary Program, the Integrated Ocean Observing Program, the National Sea Grant College Program, and the Protected Species Research and Management Program, just to name a few. Combined, the many NOAA activities support necessary ocean protection, research, exploration, and education. Therefore, the significant cuts that are proposed in this bill are unacceptable and would seriously impair the efficiency and effectiveness of the agency. To allow cuts would be a step in the wrong direction and would sustain the ''failing grade'' received on this year's U.S. Ocean Policy Report Card released by the Joint Ocean Commission Initiative.

Furthermore, it is about time for the ''blue'' of our world's oceans to get at least as much attention as the ''blue'' above us. After all, our planet of more than 70 percent water is largely unexplored. The amendment being offered by Mr. GILCHREST on behalf of the House Ocean Caucus is one way to start showing recognition for our need to reprioritize. The amount requested here ($783 million) would come out of NASA's Exploration Systems which was marked to more than $3.8 billion—more than NOAA's entire budget for the year! The cost of just one NASA mission could restore 2 years worth of funding cuts to all of NOAA, without compromising basic science and research conducted by NASA.

I cannot emphasize enough the need to show our ocean stewardship now—and stewardship for our own planet—so we can turn the tide on the dire consequences facing our oceans. Therefore, I wholly support the amendment offered by Mr. GILCHREST. I would hope that the House of Representatives would take a position that makes oceans more of a priority by supporting funding for NOAA programs that are of critical importance to our nation and beyond. This step would give us a better platform as we move into Conference negotiations with the Senate. Let us start to make the necessary investments in the FY07 cycle or the losses will be greater and more irreparable the longer we wait.

Attached are (1) a summary of the NOAA Impact Statement and (2) a copy of the Joint Ocean Commission Initiative letter in regards to H.R. 5672.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION IMPACT OF HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE FY 2007 MARK

	FY 2006 Enacted w/o Supp.	FY 2007 President's Budget	FY 2007 House Mark	House Mark vs. FY 2006 PB	House Mark vs. FY 2006 Enacted
ORF	$2,813.5	$2,678.8	$2,466.5	($212.3)	($347.0)
PAC	1,119.5	1,026.5	998.7	(27.8)	(120.8)
Other	70.5	68.8	22.3	(46.5)	(48.2)
Finance	(92.0)	(90.0)	(90.0)	—	(2.0)
Total	3,911.5	3,684.1	3,397.5	(286.6)	(514.0)

Summary: The House Appropriations Committee Mark provides a total of $3.39B for NOAA, a reduction of about eight percent from the FY 2007 President's Budget. The Mark provides sufficient funds to operate the National Weather Service and maintain satellite continuity. However, the House Mark proposes major reductions in a number of critical fisheries, protected species, and ocean related activities. Overall, the House Mark represents a major setback in protecting our Nation's ocean and coastal resources.

The House Mark includes a reduction of over $150M from the request level for the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMIS), jeopardizing basic regulatory and management responsibilities needed to sustain marine fisheries. The House Mark would force NOAA to close critical fisheries, and terminate protected species programs and the seafood quality and safety program, costing billions in economic losses and increasing the cost of seafood to U.S. consumers. Of particular note, the House Mark reduces funding for Alaska fisheries by over 50 percent from the President's request, terminates funding for the 4th Fisheries Survey Vessel, and reduces the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund by over 70 percent.

The House Mark reduces funding for the National Ocean Service (NOS) by over $90M from the request level. The House Mark reduces funding for basic mapping and charting activities needed to ensure safe marine transportation within U.S. waters. The House Mark also proposes reductions to the disaster response and restoration program, coastal services and research programs, and the National Marine Sanctuary Program. In addition, the House Mark cuts funding for ocean exploration and research programs such as Sea Grant, National Undersea Research Program and Invasive Species. The House Mark does not provide the necessary funds to sustain NOAA's infrastructure or support the pay raise for NOAA employees.

Overall, NOAA estimates the House Mark could require a Reduction in Force (RIF) of over 300 current NOAA employees and the termination of 400 contract employees, and could cost the U.S. economy over $1B in unnecessary economic losses. NOAA has outlined four priority areas of concern within the House Mark, including Sustaining Our Nation's Fisheries, Critical Ocean & Coastal Activities, Weather Warnings and Forecasts, and Critical Mission Support.

JOINT OCEAN COMMISSION INITIATIVE

Hon. JERRY LEWIS,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. FRANK WOLF,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Science, State, Commerce, Justice, and Related Agencies, U.S. House of Representatives, Capital Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. DAVID OBEY,
Ranking Member, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. ALAN B. MOLLOHAN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Science, State, Commerce, Justice, and Related Agencies, House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SIRS: As co-chairs of the Joint Ocean Commission Initiative, representing the members of the congressionally-mandated U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy and the Pew Oceans Commission, we are writing to express our grave concern with the funding level for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) provided in the FY 2007 Science, State, Justice and Commerce appropriation bill (H.R. 5672).

We recognize the difficult budget environment facing the nation and the hard funding decisions Appropriations Committee members faced in developing HR 5672. While we applaud the support provided to ocean-related research and education programs within the National Science Foundation and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, we were very disturbed to see the significant funding cuts proposed for NOAA in FY 2007.

The Committee's mark provides $3.4 billion for NOAA, which is $289 million below the President's request and $508 million below the FY 2006 enacted level, compounding the funding reductions incurred by the agency in FY 2006. The proposed funding cuts are being imposed at a time when there is clear recognition of the growing number and severity of problems that are compromising the health and associated economic benefits generated by our oceans, coasts, and Great Lakes. Last year economic and human health impacts were associated with major harmful algal blooms that impacted the East Coast, West Coast, and Gulf of Mexico, as well as tens of thousands of beach closures and advisories due to water pollution. Poor coastal land use planning and the loss of habitat contributed significantly to the losses associated with Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Inadequate research and monitoring are limiting our capacity to understand, predict, and mitigate these and many other problems plaguing our oceans.

The House cut to NOAA's funding comes at a time when there is growing awareness and support for ocean-related programs and activities. The President has taken the admirable step of establishing a Committee on Ocean Policy within the Executive Office and developed an Ocean Action Plan, following up these commitments by requesting additional funding for NOAA. A number of states and regions have established councils or regional bodies to coordinate ocean-related activities, and are increasing their collaboration with federal agencies. This is a very encouraging trend that is already generating benefits, but is threatened by proposed decreases in federal ocean-related funding.

We, along with many others in the ocean community, remain very concerned that base funding for NOAA's core ocean programs is eroding as the need for investment in marine science and operations grows. We are hopeful that the House will be able to restore funding for NOAA during floor deliberations on HR 5672, and that there will be a concerted effort to fully fund the agency when the House and Senate negotiate on the final spending bill.

We appreciate your support for ocean science, management, and education and are available to assist in efforts to implement the recommendations of the Joint Ocean Commission Initiative and our two Commissions. Please contact Laura Cantral at 202–354–6444 if you require additional information or assistance.

Sincerely,

JAMES D. WATKINS,
Admiral, U.S. Navy (Retired), Chairman, U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy.

THE HON. LEON E. PANETTA,
Chair, Pew Oceans Commission.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. THOMPSON 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. THOMPSON of California:

On page 46, line 11, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)'' after the dollar amount.

On page 50, line 21, insert ''(decreased by $2,000,000)'' after the dollar amount.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday,

June 27, 2006, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, takes $2 million out of the Secretary of Commerce's Department managerial budget, and it puts that same $2 million in NOAA Fisheries Operational Account. The reason that this is necessary is to create a placeholder so when this bill goes to conference we will be able to revisit and address the very real disaster that is happening on the coast of California and the coast of Oregon, a disaster that, unfortunately, has been completely ignored by this administration.

It came to a head last night when a number of the impacted districts' representatives met with NOAA fisheries and we were told, in no uncertain terms, that the administration and NOAA were not going to address the problems that working families were having because of the salmon fishing disaster on the west coast. They said that they weren't going to even look at this until February of next year.

By that time, these families are going to be out of business. They are going to lose their boats and, in some instances, lose their homes. They are not going to be able to pay their insurance payments, to send their kids to school, and the Federal Government is giving them the proverbial backhand. This is immoral behavior from this Department. We need to have it addressed, and this will provide the placeholder that we need to do that.

This morning, the Oregonian newspaper editorialized saying the west coast salmon fishing industry is nearly dead in the water, and everybody can see it is going to hit the rocks. But, so far, the Bush administration is unwilling to lift a finger to help. That is inexcusable. We need to step in. We need to help save these businesses. We need to help save these hardworking families, and that is what this amendment will do.

I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, it has been over 2 months since the regional office said, NOAA, you need to declare a national disaster with this. NOAA has said, we are not even going to look at it till February of 2007. We have had the State declare a disaster, the State of Oregon, State of California, the regional area. We have had disasters declared for droughts, for storms, for floods, for winds, and yet here is an industry that will not make it through this season unless a disaster is declared.

This is about families. It is about businesses. These coastal communities are not wealthy communities. The base industry is the fishing industry. It impacts every other business in the coastal communities. This impacts families. How are they going to pay for their boats? How are they going to pay for their homes? How are they going to pay for food for their children?

This is about families and small businesses. This disaster needs to be declared. They need help.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to Mr. WU from Oregon.

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the subcommittee, the chairman and the ranking member and Ranking Member OBEY for working with us to get this $2 million placeholder into this bill. This $2 million will be very, very important to working families in Oregon and those many people who fish and those who depend upon the fishing industry.

I wish that our actions today had not been necessary, but they were made necessary by an administrative agency which is absolutely not hearing our words, and it is only through the actions of this committee and this particular subcommittee that our voices are heard and our constituents heard through us.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to Mr. DEFAZIO from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the committee and my colleagues. We only found out last evening that, despite the facts that are before us, the administration says it will be at least next year before they can determine whether or not there is a disaster for salmon fishers on the Pacific coast.

Bottom line, nobody is fishing. They created a structure where people can only go out and catch 75 fish. It is not worth the fuel to go out. It is clearly a disaster. But the bureaucracy here is resistant to declaring the disaster and getting our folks the assistance they need.

So, with this, this is nowhere near the amount of funds that will be necessary, but to get to conference and within 1 day to have moved this amount of money in the bill, I believe, is a significant step for the House; and I appreciate my colleagues in recognizing the need of people in Oregon and California, those who fish for a living, small businesses and families. They vitally need some help.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I spoke earlier today about the devastation befalling the salmon fisher families along the north coast. Because of gross mismanagement on the part of this administration and because of their typical disregard for sound science, this year's season has been cut by 90 percent. Ninety percent.

Imagine how your life would change if your income was cut by 90 percent. Imagine how could you pay for you your food, not including how would you pay for a boat. And it is not only the families of salmon fishers out in Oregon and California who are generation fisher families who need their livelihood, who are now talking about selling their boats. It is the entire communities who will suffer because of this inaction who depend on this industry.

The Bush administration created this disaster, and it is well past time that they own up and take some responsibility before it is entirely too late. Hundreds of families are depending on it. Please support this amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, again, I want to reiterate what this is all about. Last year, they reduced salmon fishing by 60 percent. This year, it is almost nonexistent. They can catch 75 fish a week. The only way you can possibly pay for your boat at 75 fish a week is if you can get $100 a pound for it. Well, salmon is really good, but I don't know of a single person that will pay $100 a pound for salmon.

So they are not fishing. They can't do it. They can't afford to pay for their boats. They can't afford to go out fishing. They can't afford to pay for their homes. And it impacts the entire community. This is the base industry of these west coast communities. These are small communities. They rely on the fishermen to buy food in the grocery store, to buy appliances at the appliance store, to buy clothing, to buy bait. When they are not operating, other businesses also don't operate.

I am happy that we have this opportunity for the $2 million as a placeholder, but what these people need is they need disaster relief. They need this now, and they need money to help them, just like we do for all other disasters that we declare.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to thank the gentleman from Virginia for being willing to help draw attention to this serious problem.

I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to thank our colleague and my friend, Mr. WOLF, for helping in this regard; and I just want to emphasize that this is a very serious problem that is impacting the lives of very real people. Both Governors, the Governors from California and Oregon, have declared disasters. They are waiting for us to act.

And I have heard from countless people from not only my district, but throughout the impacted area. Barbara and Ron Kemp, who are commercial fishers from Fortuna, called me last night and said for the first time in 23 years of marriage they have missed their mortgage payment. They have exhausted all of their savings, down to the last 12 cents in their savings account. They imagine that they are going to have to sell their boat. He is 44 years old, and he has made a career of fishing. He wants to know what he is going to do.

Ms. HOOLEY mentioned that they opened periods of the season, but those periods don't allow enough time to fish, nor is the season open in the places where there are fish. They just have no fish to catch.

Barbara Stickel from Morro Bay says in May, when their portion of the season was open, they were able to fish for 5 days. They caught zero fish.

□ 1245

They are $48,000 in the hole just trying to fish those 5 days. They have no idea what they are going to do or how they are going to make ends meet.

And it is not just the fishers. It is the related businesses as well. Larry Reuter, a salmon buyer from San Jose, California, says in 2004 he bought 21,000 pounds of salmon from commercial fishermen. This year, he was only able to buy 4,000 pounds. He has already suffered an $80,000 loss to his business, and this year he is paying $27.99 a pound. Before, he had never paid more than $7.

Up at the Klamath Lodge in Del Norte County, Paula Zimmerman says that they were booked solid during the spring season, but they have had massive cancellations because of the closure. Already this year, they have lost $21,000. That may not seem like a lot to those of us inside the Beltway, but for someone who is barely making ends meet, it is everything. This is the money that they need to live on through the winter months. They cannot go on.

Mr. Chairman and Members, thank you for hearing us out on this issue. This is an extremely important issue. Our failure to act would be nothing less than immoral.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Committee also for working with my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent to vacate the requests for recorded votes on the five amendments on which proceedings were postponed, to the end that each of them stand adopted by the voice vote thereon.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Accordingly, the amendments by Messrs. REYES, GARRETT of New Jersey, LYNCH, and BROWN of Ohio, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas stand adopted by voice vote.

The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WELDON of Florida) assumed the Chair.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mrs. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5603. An act to temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In addition, for necessary retired pay expenses under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection and Survivor Benefits Plan, and for payments for the medical care of retired personnel and their dependents under the Dependents Medical Care Act (10 U.S.C. ch. 55), such sums as may be necessary.

PROCUREMENT, ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION

For procurement, acquisition and construction of capital assets, including alteration and modification costs, of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, $996,703,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That of the amounts provided for the National Polar-orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System, funds shall only be made available on a dollar for dollar matching basis with funds provided for the same purpose by the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That except to the extent expressly prohibited by any other law, the Department of Defense may delegate procurement functions related to the National Polar-orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System to officials of the Department of Commerce pursuant to section 2311 of title 10, United States Code: *Provided further*, That any deviation from the amounts designated for specific activities in the report accompanying this Act, or any use of deobligated balances of funds provided under this heading in previous years, shall be subject to the procedures set forth in section 605 of this Act.

PACIFIC COASTAL SALMON RECOVERY

For necessary expenses associated with the restoration of Pacific salmon populations, $20,000,000: *Provided*, That this amount shall be available to fund grants to the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, California, and Alaska, and to the Columbia River and Pacific Coastal Tribes for projects necessary for restoration of salmon and steelhead populations that are listed as threatened or endangered, or identified by a State as at-risk to be so-listed, for maintaining populations necessary for exercise of tribal treaty fishing rights or native subsistence fishing, or for conservation of Pacific coastal salmon and steelhead habitat: *Provided further*, That funds disbursed to States shall be subject to a matching requirement of funds or documented in-kind contributions of at least thirty-three percent of the Federal funds: *Provided further*, That non-Federal funds provided pursuant to the second proviso be used in direct support of this program.

COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Of amounts collected pursuant to section 308 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1456a), not to exceed $3,000,000 shall be transferred to the ''Operations, Research, and Facilities'' account to offset the costs of implementing such Act.

FISHERIES FINANCE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the costs of direct loans, $287,000, as authorized by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990: *Provided further*, That these funds are only available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $5,000,000 for Individual Fishing Quota loans, and not to exceed $59,000,000 for traditional direct loans, of which $19,000,000 may be used for direct loans to the United States menhaden fishery: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be used for direct loans for any new fishing vessel that will increase the harvesting capacity in any United States fishery.

OTHER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

For expenses necessary for the departmental management of the Department of Commerce provided for by law, including not to exceed $5,000 for official entertainment, $52,760,000, of which $5,900,000 shall be for blast mitigation at the Herbert C. Hoover Building and $990,000 shall be for necessary expenses of the National Intellectual Property Law Enforcement Coordination Council.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

Mr. PALLONE. 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. 17 offered by Mr. PALLONE:

Page 50, line 21, insert ''(decreased by $1,000,000) (increased by $1,000,000)'' after ''$52,760,000''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would provide $1 million for the Secretary of Commerce to contract with the National Academy of Sciences for the purpose of preparing a study on which U.S. coastal population centers are most at risk from the impacts of sea level rise due to global warming. These impacts could include inundation, coastal flooding, more intense storms, such as hurricanes, saline intrusion and a host of other damaging effects.

Last November, scientists at Princeton University released a report that found that under a worst case global warming scenario, more than 3 percent of my home State of New Jersey could be underwater by the end of the century. A full 9 percent of the State would be subject to constant coastal flooding, and so-called 100-year storms would occur every 5 years.

But, of course, New Jersey is by no means the only area facing this threat. More than half of the U.S. population lives within 50 miles of an ocean, many in cities that are at or just above sea level. What seems like a small rise in sea level, just a foot or two, could have dramatic effects on the magnitude of storm surges or other flooding events,