Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy:

Mr. DEFAZIO, Oregon

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ, California

Mr. LAMBORN, Colorado

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 481 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2641.

□ 1248

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2641) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with Mr. LYNCH (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, June 19, 2007, amendment No. 19 offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 25, line 6.

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I would like to use my time and recognize the gentleman from South Carolina for a colloquy.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you and the ranking member for your work on this bill.

Two weeks ago the House passed the H-Prize Act of 2007. The H-Prize was overwhelmingly supported here in the House with a vote of 408–8, and last year 416–6. The H-Prize is a nonbureaucratic way for government to achieve its goal of harnessing America's entrepreneurial spirit to tackle our energy challenges. The best part is, if no one wins the government doesn't have to pay.

We need $6 million, Mr. Chairman, to fund the H-Prize at its inception. Of that amount, $1 million would be used to fund a prize for advancements in components or systems related to hydrogen storage, $4 million would be used to fund a prize for development of prototypes of hydrogen-powered vehicles or other hydrogen-based products, and $1 million would be used for administration of the prize competitions.

The Secretary of Energy was granted authorization for creating prizes in the Energy Policy Act of 2005. The H-Prize gives structure to this prize authority in accordance with recommendations from industry, academia, government and venture capitalists.

I would ask the chairman if he would work with Mr. LIPINSKI, the gentleman from Illinois, and me to provide funding for the H-Prize as we move forward in conference with the Senate.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman and Mr. LIPINSKI's request for funding for this very worthwhile program, and certainly look forward to working with him as well as the gentleman from Illinois as we go to conference.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For salaries and expenses of the Department of Energy necessary for departmental administration in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the hire of passenger motor vehicles and official reception and representation expenses not to exceed $5,000, $304,782,000, to remain available until expended, of which $2,390,000 shall be available for necessary administrative expenses to carry out the loan guarantee program under title XVII of Public Law 109–58, plus such additional amounts as necessary to cover increases in the estimated amount of cost of work for others notwithstanding the provisions of the Anti-Deficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 1511 et seq.): *Provided,* That such increases in cost of work are offset by revenue increases of the same or greater amount, to remain available until expended: *Provided further,* That moneys received by the Department for miscellaneous revenues estimated to total $161,818,000 in fiscal year 2008 may be retained and used for operating expenses within this account, and may remain available until expended, as authorized by section 201 of Public Law 95–238, notwithstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302: *Provided further,* That fees collected pursuant to section 1702(h) of Public Law 109–58 shall be credited as offsetting collections to this account: *Provided further,* That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of miscellaneous revenues received during 2008, and any related appropriated receipt account balances remaining from prior years' miscellaneous revenues, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2008 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than $142,964,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. SPACE

Mr. SPACE. 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. 4 offered by Mr. SPACE:

Page 25, line 14, after the second dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $30,000,000)''.

Page 37, line 19, after the dollar amount insert ''(increase by $30,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SPACE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The chairman recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am offering this bipartisan amendment with Congressman ADERHOLT to restore funding for the ARC, Appalachian Regional Commission, to $65 million in this bill. This amendment brings the Commission's funding up so that it's equal to the President's request in the previous year's funding level.

The Appalachian Regional Commission is very important to my district and many other districts from New York to Mississippi. The Appalachian Regional Commission is a model for Federal economic development initiatives, and has been a responsible steward of the Federal funds it has received over the years. For example, in fiscal year 2006, across all investment areas, each dollar of ARC funding was matched by $3.14 in non-ARC public project funding, and each ARC dollar invested leveraged $11.55 in private investment in ARC projects over time. This restoration of funds will be offset by a $30 million reduction to the Department of Energy's administrative account.

I understand that the Appropriations Committee must make difficult decisions this year. However, over the last 10 years, funding for the ARC has remained level, at around $65 million, and the region continues to receive less Federal assistance per capita than the rest of the country. Additionally, the House of Representatives had voted to authorize the ARC at levels much higher than $65 million.

The 410-county region still faces a complex set of economic and social challenges, and will need continued support from Congress. Without basic infrastructure, economic development and improvements in the overall quality of life, the Appalachian region will continue to lag well behind the rest of the Nation.

I ask my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment to restore funding for the commission to levels equal with the President's request and the current funding level for this program.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of Congressman SPACE's amendment, which is of course funding for the ARC, Appalachian Regional Commission, in this year's Energy and Water appropriations bill.

Many Americans may not be aware that this was a program that was established back in 1965. ARC was created to address the persistent poverty and the growing economic despair of the Appalachian region, which is an area that extends from southern New York to northeast Mississippi. At that time in 1965, one out of every three Appalachians lived in poverty. Per capita income was 23 percent lower than the U.S. average, and high unemployment and harsh living conditions had, in the 1950s, forced more than 2 million people in that area to leave their homes and seek work in other regions.

Even today, ongoing changes in declining sectors of the economy, such as

manufacturing and textiles, exacerbated by globalization, changes in technology, and the recent downturn in the economy have hit this region very, very hard. It has threatened to reverse a lot of the economic gains that were made in these communities over the past several years. For an area that has suffered economically for so long, we can't allow this to happen.

By funding the ARC at least at last year's level, $65 million, we will ensure that the people and the businesses of Appalachia have the knowledge, have the skills and the access to telecommunications and the technology to compete in a technology-based economy.

As has been mentioned here by Congressman SPACE, this restoration of funds will be offset by $30 million for the Department of Energy's administrative account. ARC has been a responsible steward for the Federal funds that it has received over the past several years. For example, in fiscal year 2006, across all investment areas each dollar of ARC funding was matched by $3.14 in non-ARC public project funding, and each ARC dollar invested leveraged $11.55 in private investment in ARC projects over time.

The 410-county region still faces a complex set of issues. However, this program has made a difference, and we are seeing results.

Over the last 10 years, funding for the ARC has remained level at $65 million. And the region continues to receive less Federal assistance per capita than the rest of the country. Additionally, in the past, the House of Representatives has voted to authorize the ARC levels at the higher level of $65 million.

I would like to thank Congressman SPACE for his assistance in this program, and also Chairman VISCLOSKY for his attention to this matter.

Mr. SPACE. I thank the gentleman from Alabama and would yield 1 additional minute to the Congresswoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. I want to thank Mr. SPACE for offering his amendment to something that I believe in very much, and that is more funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission.

The ARC encompasses all 55 counties of the State of West Virginia and is an important resource to the lower economic communities across Appalachia. Some of the good news is, since the ARC was created, poverty in the region has dropped from 31 percent to 13 percent, and more adults have high school diplomas. The percentage rate has risen to 70 percent. Over 400 rural primary health care facilities have been built. And in my district, three of the counties of my district have recently been removed from the list of economically distressed counties. We have already seen that ARC is a solid investment for our government by leveraging both private and public dollars.

The Appalachian region still lags behind the Nation in water and wastewater facilities, health care and poverty. And the ARC is a major part of continuing to address these challenges in my district and across the region. Now is not the time to cut ARC funding. This amendment will simply bring ARC funds back up to last year's level and the President's requested level of $65 million.

I look forward to bipartisan support of this amendment.

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman, Mr. SPACE, to express my appreciation for the concern he has for his constituency, as well as the gentlelady from West Virginia, and my colleague on the committee, Mr. ADERHOLT, who also raised an amendment in the full committee.

Again, I appreciate their work and their concern for the people in economic development of not only their individual constituencies, but their region, and certainly would pledge to continue to work with them to address their concerns.

Having said that, I would ask my colleague from Ohio to withdraw his amendment.

□ 1300

Mr. SPACE. Mr. Chairman, with that commitment to work for the concerns of those in Appalachia, I would, at this point, withdraw the amendment and continue to work with my colleagues on this important issue.

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

Ms. FOXX. 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. 18 offered by Ms. FOXX:

Page 25, line 14, after the second dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $27,950,000)''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reduce funding for the Department of Energy Departmental Administration to the fiscal year 2007 level. This amendment would save $28 million, reducing the account from $304.782 million to $276.832 million, the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

The Energy and Water appropriations bill is already $1.1 billion over the President's request. This amendment would reduce the funding in the Departmental Administration account, putting it at last year's enacted level. The bill provides a 10 percent increase for DOE's Departmental Administration account.

There has been at least $105.5 billion in new Federal spending over the next 5 years authorized by the House Democratic leadership this year. In enacting the largest tax increase in American history, the Democrats' budget allows for $28 billion in spending over that of the President's budget request.

This amendment is designed to save the taxpayers almost $30 million, just a small dent in the unnecessary increases in Federal spending this year, which is being fueled by huge tax increases. We've constantly heard on the floor, around this bill especially, the problem of increased rules and regulations. What happens when you have additional administrators? What you are going to get are more rules and more regulations.

We are constantly adding administrative costs to all of the Federal Government. I think we can make a very small dent, but an important dent, in our deficit spending by cutting these funds. This should not hurt at all the administration of the Department and the administration of programs.

If we were going to put in additional funding anywhere, we ought to put that money in for direct services and not for administration. We hear more and more about too much administration in the education field, but I think we have it all over the Federal Government, State governments, local governments.

We are talking about deficits, not surpluses. If we had a huge surplus in this country, we might be wanting to talk about spending additional money. But we don't need to be doing that. This will benefit the taxpayers all over this country. And what we need to do is to cut spending, not increase spending. That is what we heard all last year from the majority party. I am surprised that we aren't continuing to hear it this year. When they are in charge, they want to spend lots of money.

So, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully ask my colleagues to support this, which would save $28 million and make a small dent in our deficit.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce DOE's Office of Administration by over $27 million. The bill provides $304 million, a decreased amount under the President's request.

The Departmental Administration account funds the guts of the Department; the chief financial officer, human resources, the general counsel, the chief information officer, all are integral to the functioning of the $25 billion operation of the Department of Energy.

What I am particularly concerned about relative to the gentlewoman's amendment is that the bill has initiatives that would not be funded as a result of the reductions.

There are funds provided in this bill for additional legal counsel to expedite energy efficiency standards for appliances. There has been a significant accumulation of backlog for this work. We can expedite this work and save energy in this country.

The bill also funds a review by the National Academy of Public Administration for the contracting in human resources process. Mentioned yesterday during debate, the Department of Energy has been on a high-risk list with the GAO for 17 years. The purpose of the subcommittee of having the National Academy of Public Administration come in is to get DOE off so that they stop wasting and mismanaging money. And I would hate to see that function not occur because of the gentlewoman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge rejection of it.

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

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

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment. And while they say miracles never cease, this is living proof. Despite my frustrations with the leadership of the Department of Energy, and they are great, I am rising to oppose the gentlewoman's motion to cut the DOE's Departmental Administration and make a case for why they need the level requested by the President.

For too long, DOE has been stuck in a quagmire of mismanagement, operating devoid of leadership and vision. But cutting funds that are critical to the successful management of our Nation's energy programs, especially at such a critical time in terms of our energy security, I think is a foolish time to do that. A cut of close to $30 million to this account will cost far more in terms of our Nation's energy needs than the good message it might send.

So don't be misled by the gentlewoman's argument that cutting $28 million in discretionary funds in this account will reduce the deficit. It might. But I think it will do the opposite. It will undermine DOE's efforts to oversee climate change research, improve the use of renewable energy, and provide national scientific leadership.

But DOE, I hope, is listening today and gets the message. They need to get their act together, and I agree with the fact that they don't have their act together. But I don't think this is the way to get their attention at this moment. But if I thought it was, I would agree with the gentlewoman, because I believe the intent here is more than just to cut the deficit. It is to wake them up to get some reasonable management in that quagmire that is over there and just answers to the other body's needs all the time for additional spending. So it is unfortunate, but I do oppose the gentlewoman's amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would yield back my time and urge a ''no'' vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

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

Ms. FOXX. 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 North Carolina will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, $47,732,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MATHESON

Mr. MATHESON. 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. MATHESON:

Page 26, line 17, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000) (increased by $1,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Energy is currently managing 206 ongoing projects and, unfortunately, the agency has a long record of inadequate management and oversight of contracts. DOE's failure to hold contractors accountable led the GAO to designate DOE contract administration and project management as a high-risk area for waste, fraud, abuse and mismanagement way back in 1990. Although DOE has made some oversight improvements in the intervening years, GAO noted in reports completed this year, 17 years after the 1990 report, that major problems exist in contracting management at the agency.

One quick example: On a project started in 2004 to demonstrate an alternative waste treatment technology at DOE's Hanford site, DOE officials decided to accelerate the project's schedule. As a result, the project was initiated without using key project management tools, such as an independent review of the cost and schedule baseline. After the project experienced significant schedule and technical problems and the estimated cost more than tripled to about $230 million, DOE began requiring that the project be managed consistent with its project management requirements.

Furthermore, on four additional projects, estimated to cost over $100 million each, cost and schedule information was not being reported into DOE's project tracking system, resulting in less senior management oversight.

My amendment would simply require DOE's Inspector General to conduct a root-cause analysis to fully understand the causes of its contract and management problems, as has been recommended by the GAO.

I encourage everyone to support this amendment as a necessary first step in order to better address the contract management challenges faced by the DOE.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I accept the gentleman's amendment. I understand his concern, as I and Mr. HOBSON have grave concerns about the department's record on contracting and project management as well.

This bill requires the department to develop an action plan due to Congress that will get DOE off the GAO high-risk list for their contract management performance as soon as possible, as I indicated in the previous debate, where they have been since 1990; follow its own guidelines in Management Order 413.3 for project management; and contract with the National Academy of Public Administration for a review of the departmental contracting processes, which have been a choke point of getting work done.

Again, I would be pleased to accept the gentleman's amendment and the record that is established for the department to follow through on GAO's recommendation to examine the root causes of poor contract management.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I wish to associate myself with the chairman's comments. I have no objection to the amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other incidental expenses necessary for atomic energy defense weapons activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, $5,879,137,000 to remain available until expended.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other incidental expenses necessary for atomic energy defense, defense nuclear nonproliferation activities, in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, $1,683,646,000, to remain available until expended.

NAVAL REACTORS

For Department of Energy expenses necessary for naval reactors activities to carry out the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition (by purchase, condemnation, construction, or otherwise) of real property, plant, and capital equipment, facilities, and facility expansion, $808,219,000, to remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Administrator in the National Nuclear Security Administration, including official reception and representation expenses not to exceed $12,000, $415,879,000, to remain available until expended.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses necessary for atomic energy defense environmental cleanup activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and the purchase of not to exceed three passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, $5,766,561,000, to remain available until expended, of which $463,000,000 shall be transferred to the ''Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund''.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses, necessary for atomic energy defense, other defense activities, and classified activities, in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and the purchase of not to exceed twelve passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, $604,313,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the funds provided under this heading in Public Law 109–103, $4,900,000 are transferred to ''Weapons Activities'' for planning activities associated with special nuclear material consolidation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to considering the amendment at this point in the reading?

There was no objection

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UDALL of New Mexico:

Page 27, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $192,123,000)''.

Page 28, line 2, after the second dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $192,123,000)''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

□ 1315

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. First let me thank the chairman and ranking member for their work on this bill, which provides a bold vision for moving this country forward along a path of clean energy independence and limits spending on new nuclear weapons.

My district has a particular interest in this bill, as I represent the scientists, employees, and community of Los Alamos National Laboratory, also known as LANL. The scientists at LANL are the best in the world and they work with a commitment to both national security and the pursuit of scientific knowledge. In recent years, there have been administrative and managerial difficulties, which we all agree are unacceptable. Nevertheless, the mission of the lab and the workers are the two things that I will always fiercely defend.

Stockpile stewardship, the core mission at LANL, certifies to the President every year that the nuclear stockpile is safe, reliable and accurate. My amendment will help ensure the stability of that mission and thus the rigor of our Nation's security, while also building a bridge to the future.

It will restore funding to the President's request for three specific areas, including upgrades to the Road Runner computer; the readiness and technical base and facilities at LANL; and the scientific campaign. In so doing, I propose to reduce spending in the office of the NNSA Administrator.

The Road Runner computer upgrades will increase LANL's supercomputing capability and keep the lab's ability to conduct computer simulated weapons testing at state-of-the-art. Additionally, the capacity can also be used for advanced non-weapons materials research, and thus broaden the scientific capability of the lab. The amendment restores proposed reductions in Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities at LANL, which would grind to a halt any safety improvements in the lab's infrastructure.

Finally, the science campaign is at the heart of stockpile stewardship. It sustains our Nation's capabilities and understanding of nuclear weapons, which is essential to protecting our Nation. It also allows us to keep our treaty commitments and not perform nuclear testing.

I believe that the cuts in this bill to our Nation's premier national security laboratory hurt the core mission and inhibit the laboratory's ability to transition toward the necessary work on energy independence.

LANL must prepare for the future, which includes diversification of its mission. As Chairman VISCLOSKY has recognized in this legislation, securing our Nation's energy independence is one of the most critical areas of our national security. LANL has an important role to play in this regard.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment, and would hope that at the end of this debate he consider the withdrawal of his amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of respect for Mr. UDALL and also appreciate the fact that he has made a significant contribution to the full Appropriations Committee and also understand the circumstances that he is presented with.

Contrary to what I think the belief of some Members are, we have made cuts in this bill, but they were thoughtful cuts, given a number of considerations. I would point out that the means by which the gentleman is trying to secure additional weapons money would cut the Administrator's office and potentially terminate most of the Nation's nonproliferation programs.

The nuclear nonproliferation programs are one of the few activities at the Department of Energy that are staffed, managed and run by Federal employees. In the end, Federal employees tend to be generally younger professionals with fewer years of public service and would bear the brunt of any Federal reduction in force.

Secondly, I wish that our national labs, which are treasures and do great work, would also be as adamant and as concerned about their security as they are about their budget line. I would ask to submit additional materials in the RECORD, but would point out we had serious security breaches at Los Alamos in December of 1999, June of 2000, November of 2003, May of 2004, July of 2004, in 2005, in 2006. There was an incident in January of 2007 that made Time Magazine. This has got to stop.

But the breach that causes me and should cause every Member here the most heartburn is what happened to a gentleman by the name of Shawn Carpenter. Mr. Carpenter worked at Los Alamos, Mr. Carpenter was concerned about security at Los Alamos, and Mr. Carpenter went to the Federal Bureau of Investigation to express his concern. He did not go to a local newspaper. He went to the FBI, and he was terminated. There was a trial relative to that wrongful termination. And I would point out that the gentleman who fired Mr. Carpenter, and he subsequently won a judgment of $4.6 million for wrongful termination, got a bonus.

He got a bonus after he fired Mr. Carpenter, and Mr. Carpenter went to the FBI to protect the secrets of this Nation as far as our nuclear security.

The third concern I have is some of these moneys would find their way back into the proposal made by the administration that we have eliminated in this bill for a new nuclear weapon. As we have extensively pointed out in the committee report language, since the termination of the Cold War, since regional conflicts such as Kosovo, since 9/11, we have not developed a new nuclear strategy. This is not a time to build a new nuclear weapon.

We have significant cost overruns and time overruns on three buildings we were told were needed for stockpile stewardship. None of them are done. All of them are over budget. Now let's take a turn in the road. I am adamantly opposed.

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

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

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition also to the gentleman's amendment. This is not personal between me and the gentleman, and I hope it wouldn't be when I get over too, because I am really opposed to this amendment, and I am really in support of the chairman on this, because this is something we have worked on for a long period of time.

I know the administration and some Members, those from New Mexico, are not pleased with the cuts to the weapons program. I have heard from the other body, and they may claim these funding reductions somehow threaten our national security.

I also recognize it is politically convenient to move money from a so-called bureaucracy in Washington to what is portrayed as a field-level purpose. Sorry, folks, but I don't buy either of these arguments, and I strongly believe this bill puts our nuclear weapons programs in the proper perspective.

I have been a member of the Energy and Water Subcommittee for the past 5 years, and I have personally visited every single nuclear weapons lab, plant and site in DOE's complex, and I honestly can't tell you how much our national security is protected, whether we fund the nuclear weapons account at $6.5 billion, $6 billion, or even $5.5 billion. And I certainly can't tell you what benefit we will gain by adding $192 million back to the weapons program and devastating NSA's management office, as the gentleman proposes.

I also sit on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, as does my chairman, and we both are all too aware of the funding shortfalls in the conventional defense area to believe that nuclear weapons are somehow a higher security priority.

So after years of looking at this from virtually every angle, I can tell you definitively that what we need is a national strategy for nuclear weapons and a clearly defined set of military requirements that is derived from that strategy. Then, and only then, will NNSA be able to lay out what a modern weapons complex, capability of producing a specified number of reliable replacement warheads will look like.

In the meantime, we have many nuclear nonproliferation priorities that need to be addressed. This will have real security benefits today, not at some weapons design lab tomorrow.

This bill balances our national security needs by making the prudent recommendations on weapons we have discussed and by putting an additional $398 billion above the President's request towards defense nuclear nonproliferation activities. These funds will play down the risk of nuclear smuggling by improving programs such as the elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production; international nuclear materials production and cooperation; second line of defense and cooperation; MegaPorts; MegaAirports; and global coordination among domestic security agencies, such as DHS and foreign governments.

Furthermore, these additional funds will support the implementation of an International Nuclear Fuel Bank, a priority for security experts ranging from National Security Advisor Steve Hadley to former Senator Sam Nunn to the leadership of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Getting our national security priorities right is what this bill is about, and it is a rational approach I wholeheartedly support. But let's call it what it is. This amendment isn't really about national security. It is all about jobs at these DOE weapons facilities.

In particular, the Los Alamos National Laboratory is in the gentleman's State of New Mexico. This lab has held a preeminent place at the Federal trough for years, and now fears the loss of jobs because of this bill's recommended funding levels. Los Alamos has the largest number of employees of any DOE field site, with employees who receive the highest level of compensation, and a lab that has the highest overhead rate of any DOE operation. All told, Los Alamos receives close to $2 billion a year from our bill, plus additional reimbursement of work from other agencies. And I cannot tell you what we get in return for that investment.

I do know that Los Alamos has chronic management problems, and I can read a long litany of security failures, safety accidents and costs and schedule overruns brought to you by the 9,000 highly paid folks at Los Alamos. Don't let anyone tell you that these problems are a thing of the past. DOE just informed us this week of yet another security screwup at Los Alamos, and this is after a number of others.

Given this track record, do we really believe adding another $192 million will improve security? I would argue our national security might actually be improved by cutting 1,800 jobs from a facility that can't seem to manage sensitive information. We would have a lot less people to watch.

The bottom line is that gutting the office of the NNSA Administrator by reducing its funding by almost half will undermine any chance of the NNSA actually managing the weapons and nuclear nonproliferation programs. Does the gentleman expect us to believe that jobs in New Mexico are more important than the overall national management of these sensitive national security programs?

So I am, you can tell, opposed to the gentleman's amendment. I believe the priorities are misguided. The weapons program has no clear strategy of a way forward. And this bill report addresses the shortcomings with its prudent funding recommendations and bold direction.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this ill-conceived amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), chairman of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee of Energy and Commerce.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, which would fund new nuclear weapons development by taking $193 million from the National Nuclear Security Administration nonproliferation account.

NNSA plays a very important role in helping us to secure nuclear weapons, ''loose nukes,'' as we call them in committee, around the world. The program helps secure nuclear material in Russia and elsewhere.

This funding includes $412 million for the installation of radiation portal monitors at over 200 border crossings in Russia, the Baltic States and the Caucasus region, $293 million more than the President's budget.

Rather than commit billions of dollars to manufacturing another generation of nuclear weapons, our existing nuclear arsenal can be sustained using the life extension program managed by NNSA. If we cut $193 million from it, there will be no way we can maintain this life extension program.

The JASON Report, a panel of independent nuclear weapons experts, reported last year that the existing plutonium pit will remain reliable for 100 years, far longer than the 45 or 60 years.

We don't need new weapons. Let's put the money where it will do the most good, to secure ''loose nukes'' around the world. Support the chairman in this position, and do not support the Udall amendment.

□ 1330

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, in closing, first of all, the

NNSA is the problem, not the scientists. NNSA was put there to bring a better security situation, and security has deteriorated since they are there, and that is why I take the money away from the NNSA Administration.

Secondly, I know we can't legislate on an appropriations bill, but I think it would be very appropriate to take a look at the role that NNSA should play in this whole situation, if not return to the Department of Energy managing the nuclear complex. They did a better job.

The vast majority of scientists at Los Alamos work on a broad variety of subjects, not only weapons activities. They stand ready to conduct the research that is most essential to our Nation. However, we need to make sure that these top scientists can do their jobs and have the support they need to work on other missions.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support this amendment that will restore a portion of the fundmg which is critical to maintaining our commitment to safety and security of our nuclear stewardship responsibilities.

I deeply regret that the Majority has decided to cut these programs and irrevocably harm our nuclear weapon programs and fail to maintain our nuclear stockpile. Our responsibility is to protect the American people and ensure that our weapons programs operate in a responsible and secure manner.

These important programs are our national deterrent against rogue nations who would threaten us with weapons of mass destruction. In addition, these cuts will erode our non-proliferation efforts worldwide, as our allies would have to consider expanding their own nuclear arsenals to make up for our reductions.

The cuts proposed today will cut nearly 40 percent of the funding for our Nuclear weapons programs operated at Los Alamos National Laboratory. I would ask the sponsors of these cuts if they believe that the threats from rogue states and aggressive dictators have reduced by 40 percent? If not, why are we cutting our ability to defend ourselves by 40 percent? These cuts will damage our ability to retain good scientists, preserve the knowledge base of our laboratory, and our preparedness to respond to our future nuclear needs.

In addition, these cuts decimate the nation's Stockpile Stewardship Program. Since we have stopped testing nuclear weapons, our country relies on Los Alamos to ensure that our strategic weapon capabilities are safe, reliable and secure. Failure do so abdicates our responsibility to the protect the American people.

These programs are critical to the mission of Los Alamos and critical to America. We shouldn't just simply fold up our tent and allow these programs to be deeply cut or nearly eliminated and I urge all my colleagues to stand up and support this amendment and furthermore support restoring the full funding to these important programs.

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

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

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

Mr. HOBSON. 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 New Mexico will be postponed.

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

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) for a colloquy.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, in the report accompanying H.R. 2641, the subcommittee commends the nuclear physics research community for its efforts to rescope the next generation rare isotope research facility in light of the current fiscal constraints. However, the report contends that ''the rare isotope beams will involve modifications to existing accelerators rather than the construction of a new rare isotope accelerator, RIA.''

As you know, National Superconducting Cyclotron Laboratory, located at Michigan State University, is the leading rare isotope facility in the United States and needs an upgrade to stay on the leading edge of rare isotope science. Michigan State's upgrade proposal includes the reuse of several major components of the existing NSCL. However, it does not intent to use its existing cyclotron accelerators, as they would not be suitable for the beam strengths contemplated by the new facility. As a result, if one were to interpret this language literally, Michigan State would not be eligible for any potential DOE funded facility since it is not proposing ''modifications to existing accelerators.''

Mr. Chairman, I am assuming this is a problem created by ambiguous wording and does not represent a substantive shift in the position of the subcommittee. Would you concur with my assumption, sir?

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, as a Notre Dame grad, I would like to interject myself into this colloquy. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his interest in this area.

The gentleman is correct. The subcommittee's objection was to praise the nuclear physics communities adaptiveness in adjusting its facilities plan to our current budgetary realities. It was not meant in any way to define or alter the scope of the proposed facility or limit Michigan State's ability to compete. The subcommittee remains steadfastly committed to ensuring that DOE user facilities are subject to full and open competition and will monitor the process very closely to make sure that all potential competitors are treated fairly by DOE. Again, I appreciate the gentleman for yielding and bringing this matter up.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee for his work on this issue. You have given me a whole renewed look at Notre Dame University.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

For nuclear waste disposal activities to carry out the purposes of Public Law 97–425, as amended, including the acquisition of real property or facility construction or expansion, $292,046,000, to remain available until expended.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

Expenditures from the Bonneville Power Administration Fund, established pursuant to Public Law 93–454, are approved for official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed $1,500. During fiscal year 2008, no new direct loan obligations may be made.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of electric power and energy, including transmission wheeling and ancillary services pursuant to section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, $6,463,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to $48,413,000 collected by the Southeastern Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1944 to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy, for construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses, including official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed $1,500 in carrying out section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, $30,442,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to $35,000,000 collected by the Southwestern Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures.

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

For carrying out the functions authorized by title III, section 302(a)(1)(E) of the Act of August 4, 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7152), and other related activities including conservation and renewable resources programs as authorized, including the operation, maintenance, and purchase through transfer, exchange, or sale of one helicopter for replacement only, and official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed $1,500;

$201,030,000, to remain available until expended, of which $191,094,000 shall be derived from the Department of the Interior Reclamation Fund: *Provided*, That of the amount herein appropriated, $7,167,000 is for deposit into the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account pursuant to title IV of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provision of 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to $258,702,000 collected by the Western Area Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1944 and the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

For operation, maintenance, and emergency costs for the hydroelectric facilities at the Falcon and Amistad Dams, $2,500,000, to remain available until expended, and to be derived from the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund of the Western Area Power Administration, as provided in section 423 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to carry out the provisions of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, the hire of passenger motor vehicles, and official reception and representation expenses not to exceed $3,000, $255,425,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed $255,425,000 of revenues from fees and annual charges, and other services and collections in fiscal year 2008 shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this account, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced as revenues are received during fiscal year 2008 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2008 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than $0.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

SEC. 301. CONTRACT COMPETITION.—(a) None of the funds in this or any other appropriations Act for fiscal year 2008 or any previous fiscal year may be used to make payments for a noncompetitive management and operating contract, or a contract for environmental remediation or waste management in excess of $100,000,000 in annual funding at a current or former management and operating contract site or facility, or award a significant extension or expansion to an existing management and operating contract, or other contract covered by this section, unless such contract is awarded using competitive procedures or the Secretary of Energy grants, on a case-by-case basis, a waiver to allow for such a deviation. The Secretary may not delegate the authority to grant such a waiver.

(b) Within 30 days of formally notifying an incumbent contractor that the Secretary intends to grant such a waiver, the Secretary shall submit to the Subcommittees on Energy and Water Development of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report notifying the Subcommittees of the waiver and setting forth, in specificity, the substantive reasons why the Secretary believes the requirement for competition should be waived for this particular award.

SEC. 302. UNFUNDED REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS.—None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to prepare or initiate requests for proposals for a program if the program has not been funded by Congress.

SEC. 303. UNEXPENDED BALANCES.—The unexpended balances of prior appropriations provided for activities in this Act may be available to the same appropriation accounts for such activities established pursuant to this title. Available balances may be merged with funds in the applicable established accounts and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund for the same time period as originally enacted.

SEC. 304. BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION SERVICE TERRITORY.—None of the funds in this or any other Act for the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration may be used to enter into any agreement to perform energy efficiency services outside the legally defined Bonneville service territory, with the exception of services provided internationally, including services provided on a reimbursable basis, unless the Administrator certifies in advance that such services are not available from private sector businesses.

SEC. 305. USER FACILITIES.—When the Department of Energy makes a user facility available to universities or other potential users, or seeks input from universities or other potential users regarding significant characteristics or equipment in a user facility or a proposed user facility, the Department shall ensure broad public notice of such availability or such need for input to universities and other potential users. When the Department of Energy considers the participation of a university or other potential user as a formal partner in the establishment or operation of a user facility, the Department shall employ full and open competition in selecting such a partner. For purposes of this section, the term ''user facility'' includes, but is not limited to: (1) a user facility as described in section 2203(a)(2) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13503(a)(2)); (2) a National Nuclear Security Administration Defense Programs Technology Deployment Center/User Facility; and (3) any other Departmental facility designated by the Department as a user facility.

SEC. 306. INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.—Funds appropriated by this or any other Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 2008 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2008.

SEC. 307. LABORATORY DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—Of the funds made available by the Department of Energy for activities at government-owned, contractor-operator operated laboratories funded in this Act, the Secretary may authorize a specific amount, not to exceed 8 percent of such funds, to be used by such laboratories for laboratory-directed research and development: *Provided*, That the Secretary may also authorize a specific amount not to exceed 3 percent of such funds, to be used by the plant manager of a covered nuclear weapons production plant or the manager of the Nevada Site office for plant or site-directed research and development funding.

SEC. 308. CONTRACTOR PENSION BENEFITS.—None of the funds made available in title III of this Act shall be used for implementation of the Department of Energy Order N 351.1 modifying contractor employee pension and medical benefits policy.

SEC. 309. INTERNATIONAL NUCLEAR FUEL BANK.—Of the funds made available in the first paragraph under the heading ''Atomic Energy Defense Activities—Other Defense Activities'' in chapter 2 of title I of division B of Public Law 105–277, $100,000,000 shall be available until expended, subject to authorization, for the contribution of the United States to create a low-enriched uranium stockpile for an International Nuclear Fuel Bank supply of nuclear fuel for peaceful means under the International Atomic Energy Agency.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the programs authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, notwithstanding section 14704 of title 40, United States Code, and, for necessary expenses for the Federal Co-Chairman and the alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission, for payment of the Federal share of the administrative expenses of the Commission, including services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, and hire passenger motor vehicles, $35,000,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. NEUGEBAUER

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. 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. NEUGEBAUER:

Page 37, strike lines 9 through 19.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strike funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission. This commission is a perfect example of Ronald Reagan's belief that the nearest thing to eternal life we will ever see on this Earth is a government program.

Established more than 40 years ago, this commission has evolved into an inequitable and duplicative Federal program, yet it receives $35 million in next year's budget.

Although most of ARC funding is spent building State roads, the agency also spends tax dollars on water programs, housing projects, business development, and health care.

However, this funding is only available to 13 States. In other words, this is a bracketed bill. The ARC is a redundant layer of bureaucracy. Several other Federal agencies have similar missions as the ARC. For example, an Appalachian community applying for an economic development grant would be eligible to use 20 other programs across five other agencies and receive funding for the exact same purposes. For every ARC program, it is duplicated by another Federal program.

According to the Department of Agriculture's Web site, USDA's Rural Development Agency supports such essential public facilities and services as water and sewer systems, housing,

health clinics and promotes economic development. In other words, under the current Department of Agriculture programs, these communities could apply for these grants instead of having a separate bracketed amount of money.

At the Department of Housing and Urban Development, there is a rural housing and economic development program within the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Departments of Transportation and Commerce, for example, and even the Department of Defense, have programs whose mission is to help rural communities.

Therefore, if we were to eliminate the ARC, applicants could still apply for countless other grants from other agencies that are already providing funding for rural communities.

I represent a rural community, and so I understand the unique challenges facing rural America today. However, as we work to help communities overcome their challenges, we should do it in such a way that we are not wasting taxpayer dollars.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, as I stated earlier, there is a role and a need for the ARC to assist distressed counties in Appalachia with local economic development and to provide infrastructure requirements.

Of the original 223 distressed counties, 74 remain in that category; and clearly the mission of the ARC has not yet been fully realized. The fact is the committee did reduce the administration's request for this account by $30 million and has targeted all of the funds in this bill for those distressed counties. So I would be in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON).

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to eliminate funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission. I have been against the Appalachian Regional Commission since I was on the Budget Committee in 1995. But I do appreciate the chairman's cutting the funding back because we always have a problem dealing with the Senate on this issue.

But let me tell you, for all of the heartburn we have had over congressional earmarks and administration earmarks, I would point out that funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission basically provides earmarks designated by the Governors of 13 Appalachian States. If we are cutting our earmarks, then we should be reducing these as well. The one thing we should not do is delegate our decision-making to the authority of these Governors, no matter how well intended the purposes are.

And I have to tell you, we have been throwing this money into these counties for all these years, and they are still at these levels. It doesn't do any good. It just goes down the tube. We should do programs that really help the quality of life in these regions and help them move out, rather than doing these little projects that keep them in the poverty level. So I support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I was going to point out exactly the point that the gentleman made about the earmarks. There is $300,000 for central Pennsylvania's largest kitchen, $20,000 to renovate an abandoned hospital for a possible visual arts center, $7,000 to place 16 poster-size vignettes in culturally significant areas in Connellsville, Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, economic development is important to all America. It is important to rural America; but what is also important to America is fiscal responsibility, keeping taxes lower.

If we keep spending money the way we are spending money now, we are going to have to raise taxes. In fact, the Democratic budget passed what is going to be the largest tax increase in American history. The government doesn't have an income problem; the government has a spending problem. When you look at the revenues over the last few years because we lowered taxes and let the American people keep their money and let the American people invest and let small businesses create jobs all across America, what happened? Well, the economy got better. What happened to tax revenues? Tax revenues are increasing at a fairly substantial rate.

What we have to do is cut spending so spending is growing at a slower rate than the revenues. That is the only way we are ever going to be able to balance our budget. I urge support of my amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, despite the eloquence and persuasiveness of my ranking member and good friend, Mr. HOBSON, I remain opposed and would ask the membership to vote against the amendment.

Mr. SPACE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment.

For four decades now, the Appalachian Regional Commission has worked to bring Appalachia to economic parity with the rest of the country.

The statistics are devastating. Twenty percent of Appalachian households still do not have access to community water systems. Sixty-two percent of Appalachian counties have a higher unemployment rate than the national average.

I want to make one thing clear. The Commission's programs are NOT duplicative. They complement Federal activities and extend the reach of those programs into the most challenging parts of Appalachia.

The Commission acts as a key financial partner in attracting private and non-profit investment to the region. In Fiscal Year 2006, every dollar of ARC funding leveraged $3.14 in other public funding and $11.55 in private investment.

The modest amount of money we spend on this program is fiscally responsible and enormously beneficial to the taxpayer. The President's own Budget requests that the Commission's funding level continue at $65 million.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1345

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

For necessary expenses of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board in carrying out activities authorized by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, $22,499,000, to remain available until expended.

DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY

For necessary expenses of the Delta Regional Authority and to carry out its activities, as authorized by the Delta Regional Authority Act of 2000, notwithstanding sections 382C(b)(2), 382F(d), and 382M(b) of said Act, $6,000,000, to remain available until expended.

DENALI COMMISSION

For expenses of the Denali Commission including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment as necessary and other expenses, $1,800,000, to remain available until expended, notwithstanding the limitations contained in section 306(g) of the Denali Commission Act of 1998.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MRS. MUSGRAVE

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 16 offered by Mrs. MUSGRAVE:

Page 38, strike lines 7 through 13.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would eliminate funding for the Denali Commission. This amendment would save taxpayers $1.8 million.

In fiscal year 2007, the Denali Commission received $49.5 million. The President's request in this fiscal year for 2008 is $1.8 million and the bill provides that entire amount.

When we look at the State of Alaska, it has a very low tax burden. Alaska has no State income tax. It has the

lowest taxes as a percentage of per capita income of any State in the country. Also, Alaska is actually a relatively wealthy State in terms of per capita income.

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

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I would simply indicate that I would be happy to accept the gentlewoman's amendment and if my colleague the ranking member would have an observation, I would invite him to.

Mr. HOBSON. I am also willing to accept the amendment.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Reclaiming my time, I thank both the gentlemen and look forward to our efforts to save the American taxpayers $1.8 million.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

For necessary expenses of the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, including official representation expenses (not to exceed $21,000), $925,559,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated herein, $37,250,000 shall be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund: *Provided further*, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections estimated at $757,720,000 in fiscal year 2008 shall be retained and used for necessary salaries and expenses in this account, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 2008 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2008 appropriation estimated at not more than $167,839,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, $8,144,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections estimated at $7,330,000 in fiscal year 2008 shall be retained and be available for necessary salaries and expenses in this account, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 2008 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2008 appropriation estimated at not more than $814,000.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

For necessary expenses of the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, as authorized by Public Law 100–203, section 5051, $3,621,000, to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund, and to remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL COORDINATOR FOR ALASKA NATURAL GAS TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

For necessary expenses for the Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects pursuant to the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act of 2004, $2,322,000.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before Congress as described in 18 U.S.C. 1913.

SEC. 502. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in this Act or any other appropriation Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. SCHMIDT

Mrs. SCHMIDT. 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 Mrs. SCHMIDT:

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

SEC. 503. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership initiative for the transfer or storage of spent nuclear fuel or high-level radioactive waste to any site that is not a site where facilities for reprocessing of that fuel or waste have been constructed or are under construction, or used to retain spent nuclear fuel or high-level radioactive waste for permanent storage at such a site where facilities for reprocessing of fuel or waste have been constructed or are under construction.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

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

This amendment that I am offering, and plan to withdraw, is based on legislation I have introduced with Congressmen WILSON and SPACE, H.R. 2282, the Nuclear Waste Storage Prohibition Act.

Currently, there are 11 sites around our Nation that are under consideration for hosting one or more facilities related to the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership, called GNEP. It's an initiative that is being studied as we speak. The Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant located in my district in Piketon, Ohio, is one of the 11 sites. The other sites include locations in Tennessee, South Carolina, Kentucky, New Mexico, Illinois, Washington and Idaho. Everyone representing one of these sites or an area nearby has a strong interest in how this important initiative proceeds.

The point of my amendment is to ensure that none of these GNEP sites that have been under consideration only become a de facto storage site for spent nuclear fuel. My amendment prohibits DOE from using funds to transfer spent nuclear fuel or high-level radioactive waste to any site unless it is a site where the reprocessing facility for this material is either under construction or has been completed.

In addition, my amendment also ensures the final end product after the fuel has been recycled is moved offsite as quickly as possible, either to the next stage in the nuclear fuel recycling process or to Yucca Mountain, which remains our Nation's long-term and permanent storage facility.

DOE has not made any statements to suggest that any of those 11 sites would ever become a de facto waste storage site. On the contrary, DOE and this Congress have made clear over the years that the final end product will be permanently stored at Yucca Mountain. However, based on feedback from my constituents, who generally speaking are very excited by the potential opportunities of this initiative, there are some concerns related to long-term storage. I am sure I am not the only one who has heard these concerns, and Congress must assure these communities that their worst fears will never become a reality. This amendment would help accomplish this goal.

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

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the recognition. I understand the gentlelady's concern and, with the observation that she is going to withdraw her amendment, have a number of points to make but will simply enter those into the RECORD.

Proceeding with construction of nuclear spent fuel recycling facilities at this time is premature.

Geologic capacity exists at Yucca Mountain to accommodate much more high level waste than currently permitted by legislation

Spent fuel recycling is not economically viable given affordable fresh supplies of uranium fuel

On-site storage of nuclear spent fuel is safe for 50 to 100 years, so there is no rush, but there could be cost savings from removing spent fuel from the nine decommissioned nuclear reactor sites.

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

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Ohio has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. I yield to the ranking member.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlelady's withdrawing of the amendment. At the time this proposal came up, I was the chairman of the committee and we worked together on this with the current chairman. GNEP was a proposal that was put out for people to raise their hand if they were interested in the project. It was never intended that the project be a permanent disposition site. So I think your people should understand that it was only an interim site. I would recommend that the record show that it is

only an interim site that is intended if they are successful in receiving a GNEP award.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. I appreciate the ranking member's comments. I would like to continue to work with you so that we can put some language into the record that would assure the folks in the 11 States where GNEP is being pursued that this is indeed an interim storage facility and not a permanent storage facility.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MRS. MUSGRAVE

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. 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. 9 offered by Mrs. MUSGRAVE:

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

SEC. 503. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 0.5 percent.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My amendment would cut one-half of 1 percent spending from the Energy and Water appropriations bill. I am offering this amendment to this bill to make a cut of just one-half percent of the overall funding of the bill.

With the national debt at an all-time high, Mr. Chairman, of $8.8 trillion, Congress is leaving a very sad legacy for the next generation. I believe that we in Congress must take responsibility for this burden by establishing Federal spending priorities and setting spending caps for some programs and eliminating unnecessary spending for others. When you look at this amount of money, when you look at this huge amount that we are spending, I believe that it is very reasonable to ask for this modest cut. We owe it to the taxpayers whose money we are spending to make a serious commitment to fiscal responsibility and we need to exercise fiscal restraint.

The simple truth is that the money we stand here today to spend is not our own. The funds that we are appropriating come from the hard-earned incomes of families across this country. The families in my district in eastern Colorado need money for groceries, to buy gas for their cars, to educate their children, and I think that when we are here on this floor talking about this issue, we ought to think about the families in Colorado and around the Nation that work very hard to make ends meet.

I know that there are worthy programs in this bill and I commend the work of the chairman and the ranking member, but I think we need to realize that this fiscal responsibility is what we should be exercising right now. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and really to demonstrate to the American public that we remember where this money comes from as we spend it and make our decisions here in this Chamber.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong objection to the gentlelady's amendment and would point out a couple of things. One, as we stated in opening debate, we very carefully looked at all the accounts in this bill and, among other things, made cuts in over 57 programs to make sure that funds were available for positive programs that make a difference in people's lives. One of those areas is in the area of energy and specifically the high cost of gasoline for consumers across the country.

One of the things that we did do is to add money in this legislation, $130 million above the President's request, to provide $503 million for new vehicle technologies and for biofuels. Another area as far as the energy crisis was the change in the overall request relative to climate change and, again, funds were made available for such things as research, development and demonstration of new energy technologies in solar, geothermal, wind, hydropower, fossil and nuclear energy as well as research, development and demonstration of conservation technologies for buildings and industries as well as the deployment of energy conservation through weatherization in Federal buildings.

There are a lot of very positive things that we have done in this legislation to advance a positive energy agenda. The gentlewoman's amendment would be hurtful to those efforts and I am opposed to her amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

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

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. 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 Colorado will be postponed.

□ 1400

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. WILSON OF NEW MEXICO

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. 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 Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico:

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

SEC. ____. Of the funds made available in title III under the heading ''Science'', $37,000,000 is for the Medical Applications and Measurement Science Program.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I have offered an amendment, and I will tell my colleagues I intend to withdraw it at the end of my presentation, but there is an issue that has been festering between two agencies that I think Congress needs to go ahead and take action to resolve.

This amendment ensures that the Department of Energy Office of Science and the Office of Biological and Environmental Research spends $37 million on medical isotope research in an account that is known as Medical Applications and Measurement Science. This would restore the funding to FY 2005 levels.

Medical isotopes are used extensively in imaging technology for the diagnosis and treatment of cancer, heart disease, and several neurological disorders. The program that DOE runs funds basic research in new diagnostic and therapeutic applications using nuclear isotopes. This research has identified new metabolic labels and imaging detectors that have helped identify colon cancer, brain tumors, bone cancers and many other cancers.

In addition, this research would fund new radiopharmaceuticals to attach to specific cancer cells and treat them and prevent metastasis.

Congress reduced this program in fiscal year 2006 by $23 million because of pressures on the other part of the DOE budget, but also directed them to transfer the program over to the National Institutes of Health, particularly the National Cancer Institute. The NIH did not pick up this research; and in a recent meeting with scientists who do this research, Dr. Elias Zerhouni, who is the director at NIH, said NIH does not do this type of research; NIH cannot do this type of research. They don't have the expertise in the nuclear materials required, and also that this research must go forward.

The new director of Office of Biological and Environmental Research has said that he understands the need for DOE to conduct this research and has

said he could provide the funding within his own budget within this research at the fiscal year 2005 level if directed to do so by Congress. The National Academy of Sciences is currently conducting a review of this program, and I think this program does need to go forward.

The funds in this particular program, in the last year that it was at this level, FY 2005, funded on the basis of competitive grants programs and research projects in 40 different locations, largely universities, some national laboratories, most of them in the State of California, although also at Case Western University in Ohio in New York, and across the country, but it is critical research using radiopharmaceuticals and targets, enriched targets, that really only the Department of Energy works with. For that reason, that's the appropriate place to do this research.

Now, for technical and procedural reasons, I understand that there is a legitimate point of order against this particular amendment that's legitimate, but I did want to at least raise this issue and say we need to sort this out, that the appropriate place for this nuclear research is actually in the Department of Energy rather than at the NIH, and the NIH has said, no, we don't have the expertise to do it.

We need to sort this out to continue this highly successful research. I strongly support it, and I hope that we would be able to work with the Senate in conference to make sure that this program is appropriately funded through the Office of Science.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. HOBSON. I appreciate the gentlewoman's concerns, and we will work to try to address them in conference.

I also appreciate her withdrawing the amendment.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. 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. MURPHY of Connecticut:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to issue a permit or other authorization for any action that may affect land use in any locality if a request has been made to the Commission for a public hearing in the locality concerned and such request has not been granted.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to thank Chairman VISCLOSKY for all his hard work on this bill.

As a former appropriator in the Connecticut General Assembly, I know how hard this job is, and I am honored to stand next to him today.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment at the desk will bar the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC, from using funds to issue permits for projects that have not been the subject of a local public hearing.

This amendment is based on a simple premise. Public policymakers cannot and should not act without the input of citizens who will be affected by the decisions that they make. As legislators, we know that we can't sample public opinion by just sitting here in Washington. We need to go back to our districts and solicit opinion, whether it be in public forums, town fairs, or even at the supermarket or the post office.

A regulatory agency should be held to the same standard. This amendment does nothing to alter or constrain the final decisionmaking authority of FERC. It just assures that the commission hears all sides before making any determination on land-use issues.

Though this amendment would help many communities where FERC has refused to hold a public hearing in an affected locality, and I know Mr. ARCURI from New York, who may not be able to join us, holds this concern as well, I come to this issue with my concern through my constituents who live surrounding the Candlewood Lake area in Connecticut, the largest inland body of water in the State.

My constituents there have been unable to secure a public hearing from FERC to air their concerns regarding a shoreline management plan proposed by the utility that owns the lake. This shoreline management plan will change how they enjoy the land surrounding their homes and the price they will pay for the privilege of living on the lake.

Local feelings on the appropriateness of the plan are mixed. However, whatever residents may think, what is clear is that they should have the opportunity to directly make their case to FERC. FERC has continued to deny requests, both from my office and from constituents to hold a local hearing, and this is unacceptable, I think, to every Member of Congress.

I understand the Appropriations Committee, as well as the Energy and Commerce Committee, may like some more time to look into this issue.

Mr. Chairman, if the chairman of the subcommittee would be willing to work with me on this issue, I would be honored to yield to him at this point.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding very much and certainly appreciate his passion and concern about the health and safety of his constituents and this important issue to him.

The problem we have incurred on the committee, and this is not the only regulatory issue regarding FERC that has been brought to our attention, is we are not a regulatory body and obviously have jurisdictional issues that are set aside over and above the issues of substance relative to the gentleman's amendment.

But we do appreciate his concern. Certainly we would be happy to stay in touch with him, without making a commitment, that this issue will be resolved through the appropriations process. We do believe that the higher this issue could be raised as far as the public and the regulatory commission, the better off all the citizens of his community are going to be.

Again, I thank the gentleman for raising the issue and appreciate the fact that he apparently will be withdrawing his amendment.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, with the subcommittee chairman's concern on this issue, at this time I would ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. BISHOP of New York:

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

SEC. 503. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to review the application for the Broadwater Energy proposal, dockets CP06–54–000, CP06–55–000, and CP06–56–000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am joined in offering this amendment by Mr. COURTNEY and Ms. DELAURO of Connecticut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Let me start by thanking Chairman VISCLOSKY and Ranking Member HOBSON for their work on this bill. I think it's a first-rate appropriations bill, and I particularly want to thank them for their efforts to fully fund Brookhaven Laboratory in my district.

This amendment is a very straightforward amendment. It would prohibit

any funds in this act from being used by FERC to advance the pending application of a floating storage and regasification unit known as Broadwater in the middle of Long Island Sound.

We offer this amendment for several reasons. Let me cite three. The first is that there are serious and debilitating environmental impacts associated with this project. Serious environmental concerns have been raised by the EPA, by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, the United States Department of the Interior, the National Marine Fisheries Service, and the Army Corps of Engineers.

The second is that there are significant safety and security concerns associated with this application, and even the Coast Guard, which would be charged with securing this facility, has indicated that a much more full public discussion needs to take place in order to determine who is going to provide that security and who will fund it.

Lastly, this is the only means available to me to represent my constituents. My constituents are overwhelmingly opposed to this application, to this facility, and yet current law vests in the FERC final authority to grant licensing for this project without any input from local government at all.

This is the only means by which I as a Member of Congress can exercise the will of the constituents I represent.

So I urge my colleagues to join me and Mr. COURTNEY and Ms. DELAURO in supporting this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to Mr. COURTNEY of Connecticut.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Bishop-DeLauro-Courtney amendment.

It's unfortunate that it's necessary for the United States Congress to intercede into a pending matter before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. However, despite repeated warnings from independent, scientific, and public safety analysts that this application for a floating liquid natural gas facility in Long Island Sound needs more investigation, FERC has refused every request for more time to study the implications of this facility in one of the most populated areas of the United States.

The need for more time was highlighted again just a few weeks ago with the release of a 43-page report by the Government Accountability Office that looked at the public safety consequences of a terrorist attack on a tanker carrying liquid natural gas. GAO reviewed what would be the effect of a liquid LNG spill and explosion.

The bottom line: more research is needed. Experts disagreed on what would happen if there was a cascading failure of an LNG tanker, and GAO recommended that the Department of Energy study this issue more thoroughly.

GAO's report should settle the question of whether applications such as Broadwater should proceed. If DOE determines from an expert opinion that a cascading failure would cause a hazard beyond 1 mile, then this application is fatally flawed, literally. At some point it is incumbent on the Congress of the United States to act upon the recommendations of the GAO, which is an agency funded and created by us as an independent branch of government.

When GAO says that it is premature to conclude that LNGs are safe in populous areas of our Nation, then we have an obligation to act on that advice. This amendment accomplishes that goal. I strongly urge its passage.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. We have 28 million people living within 50 miles of the Long Island Sound. It contributes more than $5 billion to our economy annually. It provides environmental, recreational, and economic opportunity for our communities.

It is an estuary designated by Congress for its national significance. Our responsibility is to keep major and potentially dangerous industrial product out of our fragile sound. That includes the LNG Broadwater facility. This would install a floating vessel, roughly the size of Queen Mary 2, 10.2 miles off the Connecticut coast, 9 miles off the Long Island coast.

It calls for the installation of a 25-mile pipeline in the middle of prime territory for lobstering and fishing. It creates an exclusionary zone, prohibits any vessels from coming within a certain distance of the facility itself and delivery tankers. It would fall to the Coast Guard to maintain our security.

Their funds are stretched thin. Instead of being able to manage fisheries, conducting lifesaving operations, and dealing with port security, we will be diverting resources to these tankers. It would propose a new security risk.

I commend Mr. BISHOP and my colleague, Mr. COURTNEY. This amendment gives DOE the time to address these concerns.

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

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, but let me first begin my discussion by expressing my sincere respect for the gentleman who has offered the amendment, Mr. BISHOP, as well as the two speakers who have followed him in support of it, particularly my colleague on the Appropriations Committee, the chairwoman, Ms. DELAURO.

□ 1415

I would point out to the body that this is the second FERC issue that has been brought up on a regulatory matter before the subcommittee on the floor. We have had other inquiries from Members that have not reached this level that are very similar in substance in other areas of the country. I would not pretend to deny that there is a problem, but I am not competent to sort through that fact as I am not a regulator myself, to make a determination, and do not believe that this is a venue to make those particular determinations.

The amendment before us undoes the Natural Gas Act for the orderly review and decision making process for energy infrastructure and limits energy development efforts. FERC's consideration of applications to site energy facilities does not imply that the applications will be granted, or if granted, will not require appropriate environmental protection measures. Moreover, all FERC authorizations are subject to judicial review.

I do believe that FERC's application process ought to be able to run its course. And again, I regret that I have to stand in objection to the amendment but trust that my colleagues understand the impetus for that.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HOBSON. I want to associate my comments with the chairman. I have the utmost regard for all the Members who spoke on this, but I do oppose the amendment and join with the chairman.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Bishop/Courtney/DeLauro Amendment.

The amendment would unfairly target a single liquefied natural gas project, ''Broadwater,'' that is mid-way through a very extensive Federal and State regulatory process. Interfering with this regulatory review would undermine the very process that is designed to provide a thorough assessment of environmental, safety, security and energy supply impacts of the project.

I understand the desire of the proponents of this amendment to ensure the ultimate security of their constituents, but I hope this amendment is not simply a red herring to utimately stop further efforts to site LNG terminals across the U.S.

LNG has a record of relative safety for the last 40 years, and no LNG tanker or land-based facility has been attacked by terrorists. Since September 11, 2001, the U.S. LNG industry and federal agencies have put new mesures in place to respond to the possibility of terrorism. Federal initiatives to secure LNG are still evolving, but a variety of industry and agency representatives suggest they are reducing the vulnerability of LNG to terrorism.

Here in America we only have two options to increase our supply of natural gas to meet our energy needs—we can build more LNG import plants and we can produce more gas offshore. There is no alternative to natural gas in many cases.

Unfortunately, the opponents of both options are often the same people—they oppose LNG and they oppose drilling for gas. Without increased exploration or LNG facilities, where will we receive the energy America needs in the immediate future?

Natural gas is the cleanest energy source we have besides solar or wind, and it is a critical fuel for industrial facilities and is a feedstock for the petrochemical industry that makes plastic.

If we cannot produce natural gas here, we are going to have to import gas to heat our homes and import more plastic in bulk or in consumer products. That hurts our balance of trade.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Bishop-Courtney-DeLauro Amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Mr. BISHOP of New York. 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 New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. JORDAN OF OHIO

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman the designee of the gentleman from California?

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Yes, the Campbell amendment. Number 14.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 14 offered by Mr. JORDAN of Ohio:

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

SEC. 503. Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of $1,305,000,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 19, 2007, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I thank the Chair, and I also want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member. I have great respect for their work, particularly the ranking member, who is a friend, colleague and actually neighbor of mine. I appreciate his work over the years here in the United States Congress.

This amendment is pretty simple. It takes spending levels in the bill back to the fiscal 2007 year levels; represents a $1.3 billion savings to taxpayers and families across the country.

Mr. Chairman, government spends too much. And I said ''government.'' I didn't say Republicans or Democrats. Both parties need to work on this area when it comes to public policy.

But today the Federal Government spends $23,000 per household. Excessive spending hurts America. Deficits hurt America, and a rising national debt hurts America.

You don't have to take my word for it. Our staff went through and we looked at the Budget Chairman, Mr. SPRATT's committee, some notes from their committee hearings on the budget. And I want to just quote from Dr. Edward Gramlich, former Governor of the Federal Reserve Board. He said this: ''Deficits represent negative public saving, which tends to drive down national saving. Lower national savings means a smaller stock of capital for the future, which reduces the productivity and wages of future workers. Budget deficits lead to less economic growth and a lower level of economic activity than would otherwise be the case.''

Excessive spending leads to deficits, leads to lower economic growth. Excessive spending leads to tax increases, all bad for our growing economy, all bad for American families.

And it's particularly, I think, important to recognize why this is so crucial that we get a handle on it as we think about the marketplace we find ourselves in today, the changing international market.

Just a couple of numbers. Four weeks ago the Wall Street Journal reported that China's economic growth rate, annual growth rate, is 10.4 percent. Now, think about this: one billion, 300 million people in China with a growth rate of 10.4 percent. That's what we're competing against.

There was a point in the past where elected officials could maybe enact policies that weren't in our best interest or weren't good for our economic growth. But now, because of the fact that the competition is so stiff, it's important that public policymakers get it right. Keep taxes low, keep spending under control.

In the end, Mr. Chairman, it's not just about deficits and the national debt and GDP. It's about people because, in the end, it's people who pay taxes. It's people who have to deal with this debt and the deficits that we're causing by spending at these levels.

I want to also quote from the same document from Chairman SPRATT's committee, from the Comptroller General, Mr. Walker. He said, ''Deficits matter for the world we leave our children and our grandchildren.'' Mr. Walker said this, and I quote, ''Today we are failing in one of our most important stewardship responsibilities, our duty to pass on a country better positioned to deal with the challenges of the future than the one we were given.'' And that's so true.

This amendment is real simple. It's going to allow families and people across this country to keep more of their money to spend on their goals, their dreams. And it's simply taking us back to last year's fiscal level.

There are all kind of families, all kinds of individuals across this country who are living on last year's budget. A simple, across-the-board amendment that says we're going to do what so many American families have to do all the time, and we're going to live within our means.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, one of the things that we know is that the Federal Government does spend too much money. We all hear it from our constituents. They are really aggravated with the amount of spending that they see coming out of this town, and there is a good reason for that. It is because it is their money. They earn that money and they send it to Washington, and then there is a lot of aggravation with how we choose to spend their hard-earned dollars.

And the gentleman is so correct in his amendment, moving this back to last year's levels.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one of the things that we know is it would give a $1.3 billion savings for the American taxpayer, and we know that principles like this and operations like this work. When you go through spending reduction, it works.

Our States are great labs for finding ways to find efficiencies in government, and there's a reason for that. It's because many of our States have balanced budget amendments. And many of our States have frozen at previous years' levels, or they've been reduced 1 percent, 2 percent or 5 percent across the board.

And what they have found out is that, in their operations, they can move in and find efficiencies and find ways to seek a savings, and still have the same caliber and quality of program that they have had. But, Mr. Chairman, one of the things that they do find is that many times those programs are more effective.

So I commend Mr. JORDAN for the work that he has done to find a $1.3 billion savings to make certain that the pressure is there on these departments to live within their means, to try to do our best, to avoid what the Democrats are wanting to pass, which is the single largest tax increase in history, and to make certain that we give a message to our constituents that we have heard them and we agree with them. Government spends too much of their hard-earned money.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I reserve my time at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Ohio for putting up this amendment. It's a very simple amendment that I think does well for us to consider in context with what we have to wrestle with, the consideration coming from the largest tax

increase in the history of the United States being offered, $400 billion on the taxpayers. And I take it into context as I looked here with this amendment offering a $1.3 billion cut in spending, going back to last year's levels, and saying let's live within our means.

I come from a Great Lakes State. When we talk about water, I do know about water. I know the impact that it can have, the impact upon all of our way of life.

But I also come from a State that's struggling at this point in time with economic conditions that comes from too large government, too much spending, too much taxation. And in the process of trying to deal with that, going the opposite direction of where they should, they're still frustrating what's going on and producing unemployment rates that rival any in history, and frustrating Michigan from having the same type of impact that we see just last week talked about in the New York Times of a 40-State growth rate that goes on with States that not only, because of tax cuts and spending within their means, have seen the ability not only to increase some of their services, set aside rainy day funds, but also talk about further tax cuts. That's what we need to be doing here; not considering spending more in a time in our history when we ought to be considering what comes with the future.

If we see a $400 billion tax increase go in place, we see a tax that goes on for working, a tax that goes on if you get married, a tax that goes on if you have a child, a tax that will go on, even if you die. Those are issues of great concern.

And so to be fiscally responsible here and use an amendment that simply takes us back to a reasonable standard of expenditures, puts us in a place that we can afford and fund to do the necessary services, we do ourself well.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, we may only have one speaker on our side, so I would still reserve my time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. I thank my colleague from Ohio for offering this amendment.

We're debating now on a 3.5 percent across-the-board cut to an appropriations bill. It's an amazing thing in Congress; with one vote, we can slash $1.3 billion out of an appropriations bill.

What we're debating here is not simply a small cut. We're debating on whether or not the American taxpayers can depend on the Bush tax cuts from 2001 and 2003. We're trying to determine what kind of economic growth we'll have as a Nation, based on how much the government spends in taxes.

This is more than a debate about spending. This is a debate about the size and scope of government.

Well, let's put the facts on the table. The American Government costs $2.7 trillion a year. That is the largest government on Earth. And further perspective here: It's the largest government in the history of mankind.

Now, to put this further into perspective, there are only two economies outside of the United States that are equal to the size of our Federal spending. That's Germany and Japan. And what is amazing about this, what is absolutely amazing about this, is that we have a Federal Government that's larger than most economies on Earth. In fact, our Federal Government spends more than the whole of China's economy.

Now, that's simply amazing. I think it shows that, while we're debating on extending the Bush tax cuts, the American people understand that we don't have a revenue problem, we have a spending problem here in the United States.

This Congress is addicted to spending. In fact, in just a week's time, they appropriated $100 billion. Now, that's fast work even for Washington, DC.

The American people, Mr. Chairman, understand that we need to tighten our belt. A 3.5 percent across-the-board cut is a good start. That'll save $1.3 billion of the American taxpayers' hard-earned money.

I commend my colleague for offering this amendment, and I urge its adoption.

□ 1430

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentleman from Ohio's amendment, and I want to thank him for offering it.

Today in this amendment, the gentleman from Ohio is offering American taxpayers a $1.3 billion tax cut on an appropriations bill. And it is important for everyone to understand, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment is a $1.3 billion tax cut for Americans because the Democrat budget that they have produced, which pays for these increases in their appropriations bill, this Democrat budget spends all that new money by raising taxes.

The Democrat budget assumes that the Bush tax cuts are going to all go away. And by eliminating the Bush tax cuts, the effect is the largest tax increase in American history, which the Democrat majority has orchestrated in a way that they can allow it to go away without even having to cast a vote. The budget that the Democrats use to pay for these massive increases in this appropriations bill are paid for by the biggest tax increase in American history. And, therefore, the gentleman's amendment, Congressman JORDAN's amendment, is a $1.3 billion tax cut. And that is a critical point that I think everyone needs to make sure they understand.

When they vote for this amendment, they are voting to cut the taxes of our constituents by $1.3 billion. And it is really just that simple. And I could not thank him enough. It is an extraordinarily important amendment. There are vitally important functions in this Energy and Water appropriations bill that need to be funded, but this increase is not affordable at the time of record debt and deficit, and I applaud the gentleman and urge Members to vote for a $1.3 billion tax cut.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, but he shouldn't really yield me all the time that I might consume because I might consume it all. So please inform me when I have used about 4 minutes, and then I might use an additional 1.

Mr. Chairman, each of the people who have already spoken in favor of this piece of legislation, which would take $1.3 billion or $1.8 billion, whichever it is, I don't remember precisely, out of the recommended budget, the budget that has been recommended by the chairman and ranking member with a unanimous vote out of the Appropriations Committee, each of the people who had spoken in favor of this amendment has made the comment that the budget resolution has raised taxes by the largest amount ever in the history of this country. Each of the Members has made that allegation.

Each of the Members knows perfectly well that you cannot raise taxes, you cannot raise taxes by that mechanism; that any raise in taxes has to be passed by the House and the Senate in exactly the same form and then signed by the President of the United States. So it is simply incorrect, and each and every Member knows that it is incorrect that the budget raises taxes, raises the largest tax increase in the history of the country.

The last gentleman who spoke pointed out that the adoption of this amendment, which would reduce this particular bill, recommended by both the chairman and the ranking member, by $1.3 billion, that that would be a $1.3 billion tax reduction. The gentleman who made that comment also knows that no reduction in taxes can occur except by legislation that is passed by both Houses and signed by the President. So, again, it is totally incorrect to make that allegation.

Now, the first speaker, who has offered this amendment, has said that this bill spends too much. Well, I think the measure of whether a bill spends too much is whether we are doing what is necessary for the security of this country and for the well-being of the people of America. And I think what has been done by the chairman and ranking member falls very much in the point of providing for the security of the country and also for the well-being of the American citizens.

I would point out that the chairman and the ranking member and the full

subcommittee that brings forward this legislation has reduced by over $800 million the President's request, actually $900 million over the President's request, in programs that have been terminated or reduced, in all of those that have been terminated and reduced. Now, what they have done, after making those reductions from the President's request and in their responsibility to provide for the budget for the country, they have then added moneys. They have added about $400 million in the provisions for renewable energy, which have to deal with solar energy, biofuel energy, nuclear energy and geothermal, wind, and all the other good renewable energy sources which we need desperately for our national security to remove ourselves from the heavy dependence that we have on foreign oil. So that is a place where if this amendment were adopted and we were to go back to the 2007 numbers, then we would lose that increase, that very important increase of $400 billion.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asked to be notified when he has gone past 4 minutes. The gentleman has gone past 4 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

We would lose that $400 million of very important investments for the security and well-being of this country.

And I would just also like to point out that there are substantial increases, which the ranking member has pointed out, that deal with the deficits, the deficits in investments in our water infrastructure under the Corps of Engineers and also under the Bureau of Reclamation, those places where we have dams that are in need of investment that has not been done over recent years and investments that should be done in our ports in order to make our commerce go better, a whole series of things which the ranking member had laid out very carefully in his initial remarks in relation to this legislation. All of those things which are increases that are in this legislation, part of that $1.3 billion, which would be removed, then those pieces of investments would thereby become unnecessary.

So I think this legislation is right on target for securing this Nation and for securing the well-being of the people of America. And I hope that the gentleman's amendment will be rejected.

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

Again, I stand in opposition to the gentleman's amendment and apologize to the gentleman for having his State of origin incorrect, especially because he is from the great State of Ohio. But I would emphasize that this is the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for the coming year, and we are in an energy crisis and it transcends the cost of the price of gasoline at the pump. It is a true economic situation and crisis that we face. It is a national security issue that we face. My good friend, the senior Senator from the State of Indiana, Senator LUGAR, has characterized the energy crisis we face as the albatross around our national security neck. It is also an environmental issue as far as a potential catastrophic climate change that will occur if we do not deal with the issue of CO_2.

This bill makes an investment in solving that crisis we face. It will not solve all the problems tomorrow morning, but it will put us on firm footing to do so in the future.

Let's talk about vehicle technology. The bill recommends $93 million for hybrid electric systems, an increase of $13 million over the President's request. Of the increase, $10 million is for energy storage research and development for advanced batteries for electric, hybrid electric, and plug-in hybrid electric vehicles, and $3 million is for independent test and evaluation of all vehicles developed in the upcoming demonstration phase.

This bill also includes $49 million for advanced combustion engine research and development, an increase of $15 million over the President's request to restore funding for heavy truck engine research that was eliminated in the administration's request.

It does include $48 million, $15 million over the budget, for materials technology research, to accelerate the development of cost-effective materials and manufacturing processes that contribute to fuel-efficient passenger and commercial vehicles.

It includes $10 million more than the administration's request for nonpetroleum-based fuels and lubricants evaluation to expand and accelerate research and development for the optimum ethanol fuel.

And we also have an increase for technology integration of $6 million in this bill for vehicle technologies and deployment, formerly the Clean Cities Program. We have moneys in here to advance geothermal technology, to demonstrate cost-share industry that will allow accelerated research into new geothermal technologies.

We have moneys in here for hydropower; for research, development, and demonstration of ocean, tidal, and instream hydropower energy systems. We have made an investment in this bill for electricity supply and delivery research, for applied research on semiconductor material, device and processing issues, technology acceptance and technology evaluation.

We have investment moneys in this bill for solar energy research, and the gentleman from the State of Massachusetts talked about that briefly, to develop cost-neutral designs and technologies to better integrate solar heating and lighting into building designs. We have made an investment in this bill for facilities to research, test, and demonstrate the new renewable technologies.

It would be a mistake to change these funding levels and turn the clock back as far as trying to make progress to solve the energy problems we face in this Nation.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to associate myself with the gentleman's comments.

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

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the minority whip from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am here in support of this amendment. This amendment is one of the things that we have to look at, one of the alternatives, to just stop this spending spree that we see ourselves on.

In just over 6 months the new majority has passed and paved the way for over $100 billion in increased spending. We already enacted $6.1 billion of new spending in the continuing resolution and $17 billion of new spending in the supplemental.

□ 1445

And these appropriations bills have over $80 billion in new spending. As Everett Dirksen once famously said, ''A billion here, a billion there, before you know it you're talking about real money.'' And here we're talking about $100 billion of new spending.

Mr. CAMPBELL's amendment only proposes that we reduce this spending in this particular bill to the President's level. This bill increases spending by $1.3 billion over last year, 4.3 percent higher than last year. If you add this increase to the increases already proposed and passed by House Democrats last week, we are spending $20.7 billion, or 15.6 percent, more than last year. Where is all this money going to go?

In this bill, $682 million, or a 35 percent increase, for operations and maintenance within the Corps of Engineers; $1 billion, or a 4 percent increase, to the Department of Energy; $108 million, or an increase of 13 percent, for salaries and expenses at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. These are excessive changes in spending that this bill doesn't justify.

The only thing this amendment does is say let's go back to the President's level. Let's go back to an amount of money that, while it still provides for our immediate advances in energy and water, doesn't do this in a way that American taxpayers can't pay for it. And how does this majority intend to pay for it? The budget that would pay for it has, unarguably, the second biggest tax increase in American history, and arguably, the biggest tax increase in American history. In other words, there is no question that we intend to spend $217 billion more money that has to be raised from new taxes. And it's

still an open question as to how close we're going to let that get to $400 billion.

Now, this is the question: Are the American taxpayers going to be asked to provide 217 billion to 400 billion new dollars, or are we going to simply take this bill as the first step back to the President's level?

This is a good amendment. This amendment deserves the approval of our friends. I hope our friends on both sides of the aisle, the conservative Democrats, the Blue Dogs, stand up with most of the Republicans to make this amendment happen.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I stress my opposition to the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. WYNN

Mr. WYNN. 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. 27 offered by Mr. WYNN:

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

SEC. 503. Of the amount made available for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy for the Department of Energy, $213,000,000 shall be made available for hydrogen technologies as authorized by section 974 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16314).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, we have a very simple amendment here today. It would basically restore $18.4 million for hydrogen technology, which would bring the account up to the level that the administration, through the Department of Energy, recommended.

This amendment is supported by the Hydrogen Fuel Cell Caucus. I would note the leadership, particularly Mr. LARSEN, in crafting this amendment, also the work of Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina and Mr. DENT as part of the Caucus.

There are some who would say that hydrogen is too far away. In fact, hydrogen is emissions-free and it is here today. GM has 100,000 vehicles ready to go. Honda has vehicles ready to go. BMW released vehicles last year. There are buses, motorcycles, all of which are being fueled by hydrogen fuel cells. Japan is talking about 50,000 vehicles by 2015. We need to keep pace. We need to put the money into hydrogen technology.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to accept for the majority the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to accept the amendment, also.

Mr. WYNN. As an old trial lawyer, I know when to stop. Thank you, gentlemen, for the acceptance.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of the Wynn amendment to the Energy & Water Appropriations bill.

Contrary to statements in the Energy & Water Committee Report questioning the level of hydrogen technology research and development, fuel cells technology is much closer than 2050.

Mr. Chairman, our Nation took 60 years from the first Wright Brothers flight to putting a man on the Moon; it will not take us that long to make hydrogen fuel cells mainstream. Hydrogen cars and fueling stations exist; we are almost there. The funding levels in the Fiscal Year 2008 Energy & Water appropriations bill will help provide the final push we need to overcome remaining obstacles and see hydrogen cars and fueling stations become a reality.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, Hydrogen Fuel Cells are already in use in larger facilities. In my own District, the Henry Doorly Zoo uses fuel cells to generate electricity for its Lied Jungle exhibit, making it more energy efficient. Additionally, the U.S. Air Force is using fuel cell technology for its Global Observer program.

Mr. Chairman, energy security and independence have to become a reality. Hydrogen is a potentially limitless supply and a renewable, clean resource that deserves to be funded at its current level, if not more.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I relinquish the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MS. HARMAN

Ms. HARMAN. 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. 11 offered by Ms. HARMAN:

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

SEC. 503. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to purchase light bulbs unless the light bulbs have the ''ENERGY STAR'' designation.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope there is no one opposed. I offer this amendment with Mr. UPTON, Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina in order to help the government set an example for the rest of the country by purchasing energy-efficient light bulbs.

Mr. Chairman, existing law requires Federal agencies to buy products that meet Department of Energy, Energy Star or Federal Energy Management program standards. This amendment adds teeth to that standard, stating that no funds may be used to purchase any light bulb that does not meet it. Identical language has already been adopted in prior appropriations bills. Our intention is to offer this amendment as the Upton-Harman amendment on the next appropriations bill and to continue this until we are through the appropriations cycle.

Our bottom line is: The Federal Government must set the example. This is already the law, but it needs to be the practice as well.

Let me close with the fact that incandescent bulbs, which are used by most Americans, are 10 percent efficient. This sounds like Congress. I think our goal ought to be much greater efficiency here in this body, and much greater efficiency with respect to the lighting that we use. It takes 18 seconds to change a light bulb. It will take more time than that to change Congress. But it is my hope that this amendment will pass attached to every appropriations bill.

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

Mr. UPTON. I thank the gentlelady, and I join in bipartisan spirit to get this amendment adopted as we've done on the other appropriations bills.

I might just note that this shining amendment will save the taxpayers literally $30 for every bulb that is ultimately replaced. It is not going to require that we take existing bulbs that work out when they expire. We will put in energy-efficient Energy Star bulbs. It will save the taxpayers ultimately hundreds of millions of dollars.

This is a bipartisan amendment. We found two additional cosponsors in terms of Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. We're also in the middle of a markup, so to be more efficient, I think both of us would like to yield back our time.

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

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

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

Mr. OLVER. I am certainly not going to use my time in this instance. I, for the majority, am willing to accept the gentlewoman and gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HOBSON. I am also willing to accept the amendment for the minority. I think it's a good amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. BERKLEY

Ms. BERKLEY. 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. 7 offered by Ms. BERKLEY:

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

SEC. 503. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to administer the ''Yucca Mountain Youth Zone'' website.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman VISCLOSKY for his assistance on this issue and Congressman HOBSON for his agreement to accept this amendment.

My amendment is based on a simple concept—the Department of Energy, or any government entity for that matter, should not be using taxpayer funds to ''educate'' the children of America about one side of a very complicated and contentious issue. The Department of Energy's Web site includes a section called the ''Yucca Mountain Youth Zone,'' featuring the cartoon character Yucca Mountain Johnny, along with games and activities designed to convince kids that the proposed Yucca Mountain nuclear waste repository is a good idea.

My position on Yucca Mountain should not be a mystery to any member of this body. I have long opposed the plan to bury nuclear waste in the Nevada desert following what I consider to be a process based on politics rather than sound science. But I recognize that reasonable people can disagree about such an important issue. What I do not accept, however, is that the Department of Energy can get away with trivializing a very serious debate by using a Nuclear Joe Camel to promote Yucca Mountain to children.

My amendment would eliminate funding for the Yucca Mountain Youth Zone Web site. Regardless of whether you support Yucca Mountain or oppose it, all members of the House should agree that this Web site is not an appropriate use of taxpayer funds.

If the Department of Energy really wants to remain in the cartoon business, I suggest they come up with a new character that would educate our children on the need for clean and renewable energy—how about Solar Sally or Geothermal George? In any case, I urge my colleagues to join me in dumping Yucca Mountain Johnny.

What I would like to do right now, in accordance with our agreement, is yield to Mr. VISCLOSKY.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to indicate that I am happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I will not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. CONAWAY:

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

SEC. ___. It is the sense of the House of Representatives that any reduction in the amount appropriated by this Act achieved as a result of amendments adopted by the House should be dedicated to deficit reduction.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, during this process of the debate over the last several hours, Member after Member on our side have come to the aisle and proposed amendments that would reduce spending off of this appropriations bill. They do it in good faith but the truth of the matter is, were any of those to pass and should any of those pass subsequent to the actual recorded votes, that money actually stays within the jurisdiction of the committee and gets spent somewhere else.

What my amendment would do is say that if we were able to succeed on one of the amendments that reduces spending or cuts spending, that that money instead of going back into the committee of jurisdiction pool or subcommittee of jurisdiction pool would actually go against the deficit. And should it be an unusual occurrence in the future with a surplus circumstance, that money would simply increase the surplus.

This is straightforward, no tricks, no gimmicks. It is just simply if the cuts are successful, that money actually does not get spent.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to compliment my colleague from Texas on this superb amendment because this has always been a concern. I am proud to be a member of the Appropriations Committee. And the effort that a lot of Members have made to try to eliminate earmarks isn't going to go anywhere and save taxpayers any money unless we're able to actually eliminate the earmark or pass a cut that then shifts money into a deficit reduction account.

My colleague from west Texas is exactly right. I would encourage Mr. FLAKE and others to pay close attention to what Mr. CONAWAY is doing because this is precisely what I and others, Mr. CONAWAY has been working on this for some time, have suggested you need a deficit reduction account. You eliminate the earmark if you're worried about controlling spending. A lot of those earmarks are important and necessary and we all need to post them on our Web sites. I've been doing that for a long, long time. Every earmark I make I'm proud of, it's there on the Web site. The starting answer is ''no'' for all appropriations requests, but if you earn an earmark, be proud of it. But those earmarks that we want to eliminate, cut them and put them in this deficit reduction account.

Mr. CONAWAY is exactly right. This is a tremendous amendment. I hope all Members will support it because the taxpayers deserve to save this money and have it go towards reducing the deficit.

I thank you very much, Mr. CONAWAY. It's a great amendment. And I will work hard to help you pass it.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman for his support.

I understand there is a valid point of order against this amendment. If there is any possibility whatsoever of working with the other side and trying to accomplish what my colleague on the Appropriations Committee and I would like to do, we would like to work with you.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. ANDREWS). Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHADEGG

Mr. SHADEGG. 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. SHADEGG:

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

SEC. 503. LIMITATION ON FUNDS RELATED TO FEDERAL DAMS.

No funds appropriated in or made available by this Act may be used to study or implement any plan to breach, decommission, or remove any Federal dams producing hydropower.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

□ 1500

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by complimenting the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON), for showing support for hydropower in the base bill.

Hydropower has long been overlooked as a source for clean energy. I am very pleased that this bill, and the report that goes along with it, support hydropower and encourage its use and its utilization.

My amendment builds off of that effort by simply saying that the existing hydropower that we have should not be decommissioned at this point in time.

As everybody in this body knows, we are very concerned about greenhouse gases, both on the Commerce Committee, where I serve, and on the Select Committee on Global Warming and Energy Independence.

We are looking at the danger posed to this country by greenhouse gases. Indeed, that is a threat to this economy, to this Nation, and to this world. My amendment simply says that hydropower manages to address that issue by producing both clean power and power which has no hydrocarbons whatsoever.

Hydropower is emission-free, and it is also completely renewable; so therefore this amendment simply says that none of the funds in this legislation shall be used to decommission any existing Federal dam which is currently producing hydroelectric power.

Now, I know of no dam that has currently been proposed to be decommissioned that is a Federal dam and is producing electric power. But it seems to me that this is an action item. This is an opportunity for us to say we are serious about greenhouse gas reduction. We are serious about renewable energy. We are serious about a clean environment. We are serious about not doing more damage by simply saying none of these funds shall be used to decommission or remove from current production any existing hydroelectric power dam that is producing electricity for Americans today.

It truly is clean, and it truly is renewable; and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate, I truly do, the gentleman's concerns regarding the breaching of hydropower dams. Certainly, this country and the government should proceed very carefully before any such decision is made.

I would point out, however, Mr. Chairman, that there are no funds in this bill for that purpose. Indeed, I would remind my colleagues that authorization and direct appropriations for this purpose would also be needed. So I do rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. But I would also point out in a positive fashion that there is $95 million in this bill for the rehabilitation of existing hydroelectric facilities on our waterways.

I certainly do think they make a significant, and can make even a greater, contribution to the energy demands of this country. But again, Mr. Chairman, I stand in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY), the former chairman of the Clean Air Resources Board in California.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, as a former member of the Clean Air Resources Board in California, as I think a lot of people in this town know, one of the premier air pollution agencies in the world, the one thing that we have got to send a message out there is ''do no harm.'' Even though the chairman may think that there isn't a need to send a message, I think we need to say very clearly that climate change is a threat, something we need to address. We have to be willing to make sure we do the right things now.

This amendment is really a way for us to start off right from the get-go that we are not going to allow a mistake to happen that could cause major impacts on climate emissions and that we just didn't care enough to pass this resolution.

I strongly support the amendment of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) because I think we should say right off, our first step at reducing greenhouse gas emissions is to make sure we do not decommission any zero generators from this point forward unless it is part of a comprehensive plan to reduce greenhouse gases. So please, here is a motion at least we can stand up and say, we did no harm; we made sure that a mistake wasn't made.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON).

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. But I want to tell you I am very sympathetic to the gentleman's concerns. We should preserve hydropower wherever we can. We should advance hydropower. He is correct in those statements.

However, I think the amendment is too broadly written and could lead to unintended negative consequences because there may be certain structures that because of environmental reasons or economic reasons we need to take some action on.

So what I would like to suggest to everyone is that we oppose the amendment, but we work together to see, because I think the chairman shares the concern for hydropower and that we would try to work to see how we can get some language at some point that might address the problem in a more appropriate way. So I do reluctantly oppose the amendment, but I am certainly within the spirit of the amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would certainly be happy to cooperate with my colleague and ranking member, Mr. HOBSON, in that regard.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I thank both the gentlemen for their comments.

Mr. Chairman, I would yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE).

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I do hope something can be worked out here, because hydropower is the original renewable resource. And there is starting to be a bias in this country against hydropower. There is also starting to be a bias in this country in some quarters in favor of tearing dams down.

I think it is very, very important, and by the way with reference to hydropower, just look at California's greenhouse gas reduction plan. They do not give any credit for power generated by hydropower. I think that is very bad.

I think Mr. SHADEGG is on the right track. We have got to speak up for hydropower. We have got to slow down this effort to tear down dams. I know the chairman and ranking member have the best of intentions. I am glad they are running the committee. I would just like to lend my voice for this very responsible amendment that Mr. SHADEGG has offered. I hope that we can work something out.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank both of the gentlemen. I would be happy to work with them. I simply want to stress, we understand, and I think everyone here does, that hydropower is more efficient than virtually all other energy. Ninety percent of its available energy is converted into electricity by hydropower. By contrast, the best fossil fuel power converts only 50 percent of its energy.

Hydropower produces zero greenhouse gas emissions. And we have avoided some 160 million tons of carbon emissions by the use of hydropower here in the United States in the last year.

The report says hydropower is reliable, it is efficient, it is domestic, and it is emissions-free. Indeed, as I state in my comments, the report is very supportive of hydropower. I think this amendment is an opportunity to take a concrete step both toward renewable energy and toward clean energy that produces no greenhouse gases.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. 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. 8 offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

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

SEC. 503. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to send or otherwise pay for the attendance of more than 50 employees from a Federal department or agency at any single conference occurring outside the United States.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

How many times do we have Members come before us on this floor with an amendment, and they begin their statement by saying, here I have a commonsense amendment to this piece of legislation. Well, in this case, I do believe I have a commonsense amendment to this legislation, and in fact most Members of this House I believe would agree with that statement as well.

Why I say that is because the language of this amendment is similar, or dare I say identical, to language that I have used in previous amendments on appropriation bills in past Congresses, and these amendments, quite fortunately, have passed pretty much by voice vote in those Congresses.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would indicate to the gentleman that I am happy to accept his amendment.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I also am in support of the amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate that. For those who are watching, let me let them know what the amendment does.

What this amendment does, and I appreciate both gentlemen's accepting this, is to say our Federal agencies should use common sense when they go to international conferences.

In the past, there were extravagances. There were cases when over 100 individuals, government employees, would go to these conferences overseas, costing literally millions of taxpayers' dollars to do so. We are saying, let's rein that in a little bit. Let's put a number on that. Some people say this number is too high. This number puts it at 50. So any particular agency going overseas, Africa, Asia, wherever else, let's have them not send more than 50. Some of us would like it to be lower, but we will put it at 50 of their agency employees to that conference. I think just like any business or family, they would have to absolutely exercise priorities and common sense as well. We do so here.

Mr. Chairman, I thank both gentlemen for accepting this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

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

SEC. 503. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is reduced by 1 percent.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

□ 1515

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the leadership's support in allowing me to bring this amendment forward. I also want to recognize former Congressman Joel Hefley. This has come to be known as the Hefley amendment. So I want to thank former Congressman Hefley for his leadership on fiscal responsibility issues in Congresses past.

There has been a lot of talk about money on this bill, Mr. Chairman, and this is the appropriate time, because it is appropriations time. Most of the programs that we have discussed are indeed worthy programs. But I think it is imperative that we always remember where this money comes from that we are appropriating, that we are spending.

The money isn't Washington's money. The money is the money of the hardworking American taxpayer, and we ought not ever lose sight of that. As such, we ought to bend over backwards to make certain we are being as responsible as possible in its expenditure.

The big picture on this bill is the Energy and Water appropriations. The big picture is that last year this government spent, Washington spent on these programs, $30.2 billion. That is with a ''B,'' Mr. Chairman. This year, the proposal is to spend $31.6 billion; $31.6 billion, an increase of 4.3 percent.

This amendment is very simple. It says simply that we ought to decrease that overall amount by 1 percent, in an effort to save one penny on the dollar, as families all across this Nation have to do when they are having some tight fiscal times.

It would be an increase of 3.3 percent over last year. I know there are those who would like it to be lower. I am one of those. But I think it is important that Congress ought to make a statement that we can indeed be fiscally responsible. This 3.3 percent increase, this amendment would provide for that, and would be a reduction of 1 percent over the amount in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank a number of Members who have offered similar pieces of legislation or amendments, Congresswoman BLACKBURN, Congressman CAMPBELL, Congressman JORDAN, Congressman FEENEY, Congresswoman MUSGRAVE and Congressman HENSARLING, for their leadership on these issues.

I think this a commonsense issue. It is a matter that I believe ought to garner great support in this Congress and demonstrate to all that we indeed have an interest in fiscal responsibility. So I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the chief deputy whip of this conference.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia. It is a very straightforward amendment. It simply applies an across-the-board cut of 1 percent to this bill to send the signal that this Congress gets it; that we understand what the American people said, both during the election of last year and what they continue to say today.

As the American public continues to watch Congress, as we have now engaged upon and entered upon the spending season, as the spending and appropriations process is in full bloom, I think we owe it to the American people to do what the gentleman from Georgia says, which is to recognize that these dollars don't belong to the government. They are the hard-earned dollars of the taxpayers of this country.

Now, the underlying bill, as the gentleman said, spends considerably more than what this similar bill spent last year and this Congress spent in this bill last year. In fact, the increase in the level of spending is 10 percent in this bill alone. That is triple the rate of inflation and that means $1.3 billion, billion with a B, taxpayer dollars, more on this one bill.

Mr. Chairman, what that means in real terms to me and to my constituents, that means more than 3 years' worth of property taxes for every household and every business in my home County of Henrico in the Richmond area of Virginia. That is an awful lot of money.

So the public expects us to return Washington to fiscal sanity. The message that was sent last November was that the public expected us to operate differently. Frankly, I don't believe that this bill moves us in that direction. But I do know one thing for sure:

that the spending in this bill, if we don't adopt this amendment, will further erode the public trust, not only in this body but in government as a whole.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in opposition. I have been listening to this debate over the past couple of days. It seems like the past couple of years. It has been a lengthy debate.

Our friends on the other side, Mr. Chairman, after running up over $3 trillion in debt, are now going to lecture us about how we should be thrifty. You had 6 years to try to close the annual deficits, and your budget you are submitting again this year will be over $200 billion in deficit.

Now, we are not here to be lectured to. Three trillion dollars. And the Republican House, the Republican Senate and the Republican White House in the past 6 years borrowed more money from foreign interests than all of the previous Presidents and Congresses combined.

So, my colleague from Ohio, Mr. JORDAN, who was up here earlier talking about now we have got to try to compete with China, well, it is very tough to compete with them when the Republican Party, Mr. Chairman, borrows money from them hand over fist like drunken sailors over the past 6 years.

Now we are here to clean up the mess, and our budget that we pass will balance it. What your amendment is going to do is it is going to take away from research that is going to help grow the economy. You are going to cut biomass research. You are going to cut geothermal research. You are going to cut hydro research, where your own party was just up here saying what a great thing it is. You are going to cut solar research. You are going to cut wind research. You are going to cut concentrating solar power research. Solar heating and lighting research will be cut under this. Solar PV ratings will be cut under this. Hybrid electric system. We are getting testimonials from all our constituents in our districts about how they want lower gas prices. You do that by reducing your dependence on foreign oil and investing in alternative energy. That is what we are doing in this bill, and your amendment will cut that.

Advanced combustion engine research will be cut in this, materials technology research will be cut in this, fuels technology will be cut in this, technology integration will be cut under this amendment.

This is a responsible bill that was voted by both Republicans and Democrats out of the Energy and Water Committee. It makes great investments. It turns the page on the past of not balancing your budgets, not making the investments, Mr. Chairman, and I commend you and Mr. HOBSON for putting a great bill together and stand to ask our Members to reject this amendment.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the passion of my good friend from Ohio as he talks about cut after cut after cut, and I would just remind him that this amendment, this amendment, would reduce the overall bill by 1 percent which, Mr. Chairman, as you know, is a 3.3 percent increase over last year. So nobody is talking about cutting anything.

That might be the problem here in Washington. This would be a 1 percent reduction on the remarkable amount of increased money that the majority party has brought with this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE).

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership here. I think many of us miss the presence of our former colleague Mr. Hefley from Colorado, and I am very pleased to see that Mr. PRICE has stepped up to fill that gap, because what we are talking about here is trying to control runaway spending.

We are spending billions and billions of dollars, and this proposal suggests that we try to pare back 1 percent, $316 million in this bill.

Some speakers from the other side have said when the Republicans were in charge, the Republicans spent too much. In fact, the gentleman from Ohio just reminded us of that. He is right. Republicans, when we were in the majority, spent too much.

But the Democrat answer to spend more just doesn't make sense. We are increasing spending here by billions and billions of dollars, and that apparently is backed up by a budget which is reportedly balanced in 5 years by giving us the largest tax increase in American history. That is how you balance the budget in 5 years, with the level of spending that is being proposed here today, billions of dollars too much.

My friend, the great gentleman from Georgia, is proposing a 1 percent, 1 percent across-the-board cut. I commend him for that.

We are spending too much. Let's get this under control. This is a very modest proposal. I commend him for it.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I just want to clarify something. In 2008, there will not be a tax increase. And no one has to believe me, Mr. Chairman. No one has to believe our friends on the other side. What the American people need to do is keep their tax forms from this year and compare them to their tax forms from next year. There will be zero increase in taxes.

This is a balanced budget, which the other side has not done, and it makes strategic investments so that we can create alternative energy resources here so we reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for yielding me time. I will try to cover my points in those 3 minutes.

I just want to remind the members of the committee, of the Congress, of the body, that this bill came from the subcommittee with full support of the subcommittee members, with the ranking member and the chairman in strong support, with a very good and thoughtful look at what energy and water expenditures ought to be.

There are increases in moneys that are investments in flood control, in dam safety, in putting money into dealing with our ports which need dredging, things of that sort. There are substantial increases, that is true, in renewable energy, which is the one place where we can really get at our dependence upon oil that comes from very unstable parts of this world.

There were some wonderful recommendations that in large part are a balance between nuclear nonproliferation, so important, because that is where our real danger is to the security of this country in the future, our major danger, versus some unnecessary expenditures in nuclear weapons development, nuclear weaponry development. That recommendation is here.

We have had about 12 hours now of debate in this committee with 50 amendments, with offers of amendments to cut and reduce, offers of amendments to increase expenditures, to shift expenditures. There are some that have been adopted. Most of them have been refused. But everybody has had a chance. And the basic body of the bill remains as it was, as it was recommended by the chairman and the ranking member of the committee with the support of the subcommittee and the Appropriations Committee.

Here now we have a 1 percent reduction which attempts at this late date, after all those amendments have been dealt with one by one, increases and decreases, and the issues have been discussed, then to reduce by 1 percent, $300-plus million, which then has an effect on all those earlier decisions that have been made by this committee as a whole.

So I would hope that this amendment would not be adopted. I think that this is a basically irresponsible way of going about budgeting. If you can't deal with the issues and then come to a conclusion on the budget that you have adopted in that process, then one should not do what is being proposed here. I hope that the amendment will be resoundingly defeated.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, if I may inquire of the time remaining on each side.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Indiana has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the Chair.

I appreciate again the comments of my good friend from Ohio, who previously talked about there being no tax increase in 2008, and he urged the American people to take a look at their tax bill.

He is right. There won't be, because of Washington shenanigans. Because what we do here is budget in a 5-year window, and in fact the largest tax increase in the history of our Nation will hit the American people, curiously, Mr. Chairman, after the next election.

But you can check the record. It is indeed there, and all the American people have to do is recognize that, and they will. And they will.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

□ 1530

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very enlightening debate. Fortunately, I think the American people are smart enough to understand this debate. They understand that, for example, even though there won't be a tax increase before the election in 2008, that policies that get adopted this year will force tax increases in future years. I think they understand that.

I want to comment on the remarks of the committee Chair who just spoke. I think he made a compelling case for leaving the priorities that are in this bill precisely where they are. I think your committee, with the help of the minority, worked diligently to produce a sound product, a product that attempts to allocate the resources amongst the various priorities.

But there will come a time when this Nation wakes up. There will come a time when we will have to be responsible about spending on this floor.

The speaker before the last speaker criticized Republicans and said, ''You spent too much on your watch,'' and he was dead right.

This is the Hefley amendment. I voted for the Hefley amendment every time, trying to get us to cut 1 percent. Let me explain why. Because in 1994 when I was elected to Congress, and in 1995 and in 1996, we went across America, Republicans and Democrats alike, and we asked the American people if they wanted us to continue spending at that pace or if they were willing to see us reduce that pace of spending to reduce the burden on our children and our grandchildren.

One after another of them rose and said, ''Don't cut my program''; but one after another of them, every single one of them that I heard, at field hearings in Prescott, Arizona, and in Wyoming and Montana, said that if the cuts are even, if the cuts are evenly spread and fair to everyone, then, yes, you are right. We have to rein in spending to a level we can live with. That is what this amendment does. It is responsible. It is good public policy. I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I would like to clarify. The other side is trying to say that if there are tax increases in the future, it all has to do with this bill which we just increased by a few hundred million. It has nothing to do with the $3 trillion debt that was run up in the last 6 years, Mr. Chairman. The 2007 tax returns versus next year's, the American people need to look at them, no increase. Our friends are saying ''the largest tax increase in the history of the United States'' and it happens 2 years from now. I thought history was in the past. For 2008, check your returns, no tax increases.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY).

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, the American people have listened to Democrats and Republicans blame each other about budget crises. I became a Member in 1995. I left for 5 years. How things change. The parties change names, but it is the same tactics.

The American people want us working together on the budget. This amendment is a minimal effort of just saying to the American people, look, we recognize that even the best operation and the best budget can still be operated on 99 percent of what was projected. It is a minimalist kind of approach to this. If you can't vote for a 1 percent across-the-board cut, go to your town hall meetings, go into your communities and say, well, I really didn't want to do it because of what it symbolized. The fact is that this is the minimum of what we can do to say, look, we are trying to get back in the discipline of doing the right thing by the American taxpayer.

And if you can't vote for a 1 percent, how can you expect in the long run to be able to control the Federal budget, and that is exactly what the constituency wants us to do.

So I just say dump the Republican and Democrat argument. You get back to the fact that you have a motion that says quite clearly: we will make the effort of a 1 percent reduction across the board. That is a very small, little step towards fiscal responsibility and let's get together, Democrats and Republicans, and do the right thing and support the new Hefley amendment as authored by the gentleman from Georgia. If you can't do that, please don't think you can stand up and carry the mantle of self-righteousness when it comes to budget. We all bear the responsibility. Even those of us who weren't here bear the responsibility of doing the right thing and dumping the jargon about being Democrat or Republican and the other guy is at fault. We all bear that responsibility, and the voters and the taxpayers will blame all of us, regardless of our party affiliation, if we can't even make this minimal stance of a 1 percent across-the-board.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time. I have one remaining speaker, and it is my understanding it is my prerogative to close.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, is it the chairman's prerogative to close?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Yes, the chairman is defending the bill, and it is his prerogative to close.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, let me first say I support this 1 percent, just like I did last year and the year before. Just to make sure that the American public understands, this is 1 percent off of the nearly 5 percent increase. So it isn't even a reduction from last year's number of 1 percent. It is simply shaving 1 percent off of the increase.

I came down here because I heard some of the speakers on the other side, or at least one, that was talking about they had to correct the problems of the Republicans spending like drunken sailors, which kind of amazed me considering that the debate on the House floor in the last 2 years on appropriations was how we weren't giving enough money.

When I looked up to see what the Republican bill was last year when we were in the majority, it was a 1.5-percent increase versus the nearly 5 percent this time. So they are up here talking about an increase of about 2½ times, maybe three times what we originally proposed last year. And by the way, I supported the 1 percent when it was only a 1.5-percent increase below the rate of inflation. I think that is the type of drunken spending that the American taxpayers told us in the last election that they did not want. They want that type of fiscal restraint, not two or three times the rate of inflation. They want fiscal responsibility injected back into our reasoning and the bills that we are passing.

So I think a reduction of this 4.5-, 4.7-percent increase is simply the responsible thing to do.

The gentleman from Georgia, I appreciate you bringing this 1 percent. I think that this is something that the voters, strike voters, the American public thinks we should be doing this year. We come off the heels last week of voting for bills with double-digit increases. So this is a time to inject some reasonableness.

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

I think this has been a helpful debate. I want to recognize the efforts of Congressman Hefley in the past and urge my colleagues to support the former Hefley amendment of a 1-percent reduction in the increase, Mr.

Chairman. As I remind our colleagues, the portion appropriated for this area of Federal spending last year was $30.2 billion. This year the request in this bill is for $31.6 billion. This amendment would simply reduce it by 1 percent. It would be a 3.3-percent increase. It would be a symbolic decrease, but it would be a recognition that Washington needs to get its fiscal house in order.

My good friends on the other side of the aisle talk about the importance of reducing spending. But yet we see a significant increase over, as the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) just said, significantly over what we brought last year. Yes, it would be a symbolic decrease, but it would ever so slightly reduce that slope, that increasing slope of Federal spending. I think that is indeed what the American people desire.

Spending in this bill, as in other appropriations bills that are coming before us, will be allocating money, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress doesn't have. The Congress doesn't have it, and it continues to spend more than it takes in. I think it is imperative that we harken back and remember that wonderful Reagan admonition that Washington spends too much, it is not that it doesn't gain enough revenue. There is certainly enough revenue to provide for appropriate services.

And I will be the first to tell my colleagues that there are wonderful programs within this bill. The question is whether or not we are going to demonstrate to the American people that we have the fiscal responsibility, the reasonable standards in terms of what ought to be spent at the Federal level based upon what has been spent in the past and the incredible hardworking American taxpayers who send their money year after year after year. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense 1-percent reduction.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to a member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR).

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

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, Joel Hefley was a dear friend of mine. We worked together on the Ethics Committee. I have to tell you, Joel and I would talk about his 1 percent across-the-board cuts. While the Republicans were in the majority, they failed. They failed because Republicans and Democrats knew that in this particular bill, Energy and Water, you had the chairman and the vice chairman working in cooperation with Republicans and Democrats looking at the priorities and developing a bill that would invest in the infrastructure of America.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, for many years the investment in infrastructure has either been static, and in many cases has been declining. Hearing after hearing after hearing, we had businessmen, barge owners, operators, grain operators coming to the committee and saying you need to invest more money in the infrastructure of America because it is the commerce that the Mississippi River handles. It is the commerce that comes into our harbors. It is the commerce that is driving America and making it a productive country.

And so when you have the business community, elected officials coming to you and telling you that there is a decline in the investment in infrastructure, it is the Subcommittee on Energy and Water that begins to respond to that need.

As an example, in Brunswick, Georgia, the request came that we need to deepen the harbor so that the harbor can allow more ships to come in and be able to continue that driving engine, commerce.

In Sacramento, California, we have had untold numbers of public officials come to tell us you need to invest in flood control because we are this close to being over our heads in water. Again, an investment in infrastructure.

In Kentucky we had a Congressman in our markup in to ask why is it that my particular flood control project, an investment in infrastructure, is not being considered in an earmark. We are being threatened by not having this flood control structure. Again, an investment in infrastructure to protect our communities.

We had people from New York and New Jersey: we need to deepen the harbor. We have to make sure that the ships coming from overseas not only have secured cargo, but that we have cargo coming in so that the commerce can continue to develop.

Oakland Harbor, Los Angeles Harbor, Long Beach Harbor, Galveston, Corpus Christi, New Orleans.

The New Orleans elected officials came and said we need development of flood control structures in New Orleans in order to protect if there is another hurricane.

But the one that impressed me the most was the people along the Mississippi. They said grain, coal, a number of products go up and down the Mississippi. It is the blood line of commerce for this country. And the problem we have is that our locks are not working properly.

So in this bill we are investing in improving, and in some cases bringing in new locks, so that from the most northern point of this country to the most southern point of this country along the Mississippi River, we can have commerce, so grain can be moved, coal can be moved, so this country can be competitive on a global basis.

□ 1545

So I tell you, Mr. Chairman, this work, the Energy and Water Subcommittee bill that is before us, it deals with infrastructure development. A 1 percent cut would begin to deny many of these improvements that we have, improvements that the American public have asked us to do because they know it is a sound investment. They want to make sure that commerce continues. They want to make sure that they're protected.

And as Joel Hefley would probably tell me, ED, I couldn't do it in the majority, I probably won't do it in the minority, because the American people think that 1 percent is not the proper way to go, because I would like to have that money that belongs to me to be invested in order that we protect our communities and ensure that we have commerce.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman's comments very much.

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

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

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. 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 Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. WILSON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. 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. 15 offered by Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

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

SEC. 503. Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of $1,130,000,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I want to thank Congressman JOHN CAMPBELL of California who originally was the proponent of this amendment. I am very happy to adopt this amendment because I believe that it truly expresses the concerns of the people of our country.

The Energy and Water appropriations bill, which spends $31.6 billion, is $1.13 billion, or 3.7 percent over the President's request. This amendment would reduce overall funding in the bill to the President's request, thus saving taxpayers $1.13 billion. If this amendment passes, the total amount of spending in the Energy and Water bill will still be $175 million greater than last year.

By enacting the largest tax increase in American history, the Democrat

budget allows for $23 billion in spending over that of the President's budget request. This amendment is designed to save the taxpayers $1.13 billion which will reduce some of the unnecessary increases in Federal spending this year which is fueled by the huge tax increases. This is an amendment that is an across-the-board reduction that does not destroy, interrupt or terminate needed projects, many that we just heard about that are very, very worthy. But it does provide for our Federal administrators to reduce expenditures by limiting travel, delaying filling employee vacancies, postponing equipment purchases and other innovative and creative initiatives to save taxpayers' money. Even the reduction of growth is an increase of spending of $175 million.

Prior to being elected to Congress, I served in the State senate of my home State and over and over again we would work toward across-the-board budget cuts and each time that we were able to achieve these, we were able to maintain the programs to benefit the citizens of our State; but, indeed, the programs were not terminated, they were made better. I have faith in government employees that they can accommodate a 3.7 percent reduction without hurting recipients of worthy projects.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 15 minutes.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman JOHN KLINE.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. I thank my friend and colleague, Mr. WILSON, for his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise because we have had a debate here about how much money we're spending and how much we're taxing. There seems to be some confusion about that. We on this side of the aisle have been accused of having spent too much money. And, as I said in discussing an earlier amendment, I fully agree. The Republican majority spent too much money. But what we have before us is a proposal to spend even more money while we're getting criticism for having spent too much, and I have a hard time balancing those out.

We need to get spending under control. And we've had my colleagues, colleague after colleague have come to the floor to propose amendments to make modest reductions in what appears to be runaway spending, billions of dollars too much. And then we've had an argument that said, well, we're not taxing too much because we're not going to add to the tax burden in 2008. I suppose that remains to be seen before the process is over, but I think it's undeniable that the Democrats passed a budget which in order to balance in 5 years results in the largest tax increase in American history. And as the spending goes up to make that match in the end, they force all of the tax cuts which we have fought so hard to get into place, that have spurred this economy and caused jobs to be created and rapid growth in the economy, all those tax cuts would go away, taxes would go up, and we would in fact see the largest tax increase in American history. So we have a huge tax increase, huge spending, that's not the way to see this economy grow. Let's take some steps to curb this explosive rate of spending and stop the semantic arguments here. Let's slow down this runaway spending.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Inquiry. Does the chairman have any witnesses at this time or any further testimony?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I simply have two speakers and would prefer to reserve at this moment.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, again what we're talking about with this particular amendment is to reduce the overall expenditures to the President's request, which is a reduction of $1.13 billion. It's a 3.7 percent reduction. But actually because this is the request of the President, there has been an increase of nearly $175 million. We've heard the presentation, very eloquent, a few minutes ago of many of the wonderful programs and projects, and when you think of Energy and Water appropriations, I think of extraordinarily important appropriations, indeed, the infrastructure of our country, it's so important, as to the alternative fuels, promoting the alternative fuels. But, indeed, I have seen firsthand in my experience working in public office since 1984, you can reduce and still provide for the services to be provided.

I know that again in my State experience one time, we had a midyear budget crisis where, in fact, the State budget was reduced by 7½ percent and we had previously proposed that there be a budget reduction of 1 percent. Unfortunately, it was turned down. It was incredible that, indeed, with the 7½ percent across-the-board cut by people of another political party from me, it worked. And the services were still provided. That was, in effect, almost a 15 percent across-the-board cut.

And so what we are proposing today, I believe, is very reasonable and responsible and in the interest of the taxpayers of the United States.

At this time I am happy to yield to the minority leader of the House of Representatives, a person who is so widely respected, the Congressman from Ohio, JOHN BOEHNER.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The distinguished minority leader is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BOEHNER. I appreciate my colleague for yielding and I appreciate the work he is doing bringing this amendment to the floor.

I came to Washington 17 years ago because I thought government was too big, I thought it spent too much and didn't think that it was being held accountable. And the reason I am here this afternoon on this bill is because this amendment offered by Mr. WILSON and Mr. CAMPBELL will reduce the overall spending level in this bill to the President's request.

The President submitted a budget back in January that said we can balance the budget over the next 5 years without raising taxes. But to do that, it's dependent upon us holding the line on spending. Even at the President's level, there is an increase over last year, and I believe that bringing the level of spending down in this bill to what the President requested puts this bill in a position to actually move through the process and become law.

If you looked over the course of this year, our friends on the other side of the aisle have a budget that will balance over the next 5 years, but with the largest tax increase in American history. If we want to review the bidding on spending here in Washington this year, you go back to February with a CR that was some $6 billion over the President's request. And then we can look at the supplemental spending bill for Iraq and Katrina and other things that was $17 billion over the President's request. And now if we look at the appropriations process that we're in the midst of, we have an additional $20 billion over and above where the President is.

At the end of the day, the American people want to keep more of the money that they earn and want to send less of that money here to Washington. And I think to the extent we can hold the line on spending, we're protecting the taxpayers, protecting their wallets.

I think this is a modest amendment that reduces the spending in this bill by some $1.13 billion, it's the right move, and our colleagues ought to support the amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to my good friend and colleague from New York, a member of the subcommittee, Mr. ISRAEL.

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank my distinguished chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I have listened very carefully to my friends from the other side suggest that this bill is just too expensive, that it needs to be cut. Well, let me tell you what's far more expensive.

Thirty years ago, President Carter told the American people that we were going to declare the moral equivalent of war on foreign oil. And the only thing we've managed to do in the 30 years since then is double our imports of oil from the Middle East and cut investments in renewable research and development by about 80 percent. So we tried it your way. We cut those investments 80 percent in the past 30 years. And what's the result? We've

doubled our imports of foreign oil from the Persian Gulf.

You want to know why this is so expensive a problem? It is a military vulnerability. Two years ago, the Department of Defense spent $10.6 billion on basic energy costs because of this dependence on foreign oil. $10.6 billion paid for by the taxpayer. Of that, the Air Force spent half, $4.7 billion, on one thing: buying fuel, which is also paid for by the American taxpayer.

Now, I believe, as many of my friends do, in robust military budgets. I am a very strong supporter of our military and I believe we need to spend what it takes to defend freedom, and my friends would agree. The problem is this: Because of the fact that we tried it their way and our dependence on foreign oil has actually increased, we're in a position right now where we are borrowing money from China to fund our military budgets to buy oil from the Persian Gulf to fuel our military to protect us from China and the Persian Gulf. A $550 billion military budget and we have to borrow the money from our adversaries. And, guess what, our taxpayers have to pay the interest on the money that we're borrowing from our adversaries to fuel our military to protect us from our adversaries. It makes no sense whatsoever. We've tried it their way, Mr. Chairman, and it hasn't worked.

I don't believe any one of my colleagues would suggest that we should cut the Department of Defense budget. We all believe in national security, and I'm with my colleagues on that.

□ 1600

But as a matter of national security, we should not cut this budget either, because this budget is a national security budget, because it is not acceptable that a Stryker combat vehicle that is ferrying our troops into some very dangerous environments gets between 5 and 10 miles to the gallon, sounds like a 1957 Buick and is a loud, moving target. It is not acceptable that our C–17s burn 3,000 gallons of fuel an hour and that we have to rely on our adversaries to fuel those systems.

I would appeal to my colleagues on the other side that just as they are strong supporters of the Department of Defense and would never think to suggest just a 1 or 2 percent reduction in military budgets, the same should hold true on this.

I would add one other thing, if I may, Mr. Chairman. One of the things that worries all of us, and worries our military planners, is not just the threats that we see in Iran, and we passed a resolution earlier today that I supported that would take a hard line on Iran and its development, attempted development on nuclear weapons, not just those things, but loose nukes. But the fact that there is a tremendous quantity of nuclear materials proliferating around the world that we have to find, identify and secure, because we don't want a rogue nation packing those loose nukes into a suitcase and bringing them across our borders.

Well, this bill contains funding for the Global Threat Reduction Initiative, whose mission is to locate, secure and remove and facilitate disposal of high-risk vulnerable nuclear material and equipment locations. It does increase the President's funding level. I think the American people would want us to find the money to secure those loose nukes. Now, maybe that means there is a little less money to go to Halliburton and no-bid contracts.

My final point is this: the other side continues to say that this is a tax increase. It is not a tax increase. It will not be a tax increase. The other side is not accurately explaining this to the American people, is the most diplomatic way I can put it.

I will say this, it does require different priorities. The other side has no problem allowing big corporations to register themselves in offshore P.O. boxes so that they can avoid paying their fair share of taxes. The other side has no problem funding and bull-dozing money to Halliburton in no-bid contracts. The other side had no problem shoveling tax cuts to the richest oil company executives on Earth.

If the money was there for that, the money is there for this bill. Maybe we need to take the money from those priorities and put them into this priority.

For America's energy security, for a strong future, and to get our troops out of those Stryker combat vehicles that are loud gas guzzlers and put them on something safer. This bill makes those investments. Those investments are, ultimately, in our national security.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to reduce the size of this bill, the cost of this bill.

I have got to tell you I grew up in the late 1970s. I remember pretty distinctly the policies of Jimmy Carter. I remember the high unemployment rates. I remember the high inflation rates.

I recall getting my driver's license and getting that 1970 station wagon to drive and waiting in a line for gas two blocks long; and when you got there, there was one pump yet working and the others had the 11 by 8 piece of paper that said ''out of gas'' on it. I think those are the policies which some of my friends on the left are advocating today. I just have to openly wonder how well Honda Civics would work in the sand in Iraq if we can't use military vehicles because of their gas mileage.

But let's get back to the real issue of what we're talking about here today, and that's ways of controlling spending. Yes, it is showing a difference between the majority party and the minority party in the sense of spending.

We are here fighting to reduce the size of their bill. We would like to bring it to last year's level where it was only a 1.6 percent increase, and they were yakking about how we needed to spend more, and when they got in control, they were able to do that.

They have a bill here before us today that increases the spending way above the President's request. This amendment just simply brings it down, $1.13 billion to the President's request. So either way we can fight to reduce the size of their bills, and last week's bill. Again, they were both double-digit increases.

I think this type of debate is healthy. It also does show, as one of the previous speakers mentioned, that there are policy differences. There are priority differences between the two parties, and we are showing how we are the party of fiscal responsibility.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, indeed, as I am here, proposing a cut of around 3.7 percent, this is across the board. Actually, it's an affirmation of the significance of the projects that are in the bill.

I am not saying they should be terminated. I am saying that they should be stalled. I am certainly not indicating they should be interrupted or destroyed. My being here is to propose that there be a reduction in spending, except that it's really a reduction to the President's recommendation, which is an increase in spending of $175 million.

But it is a savings to the taxpayers of $1.13 billion. That's, indeed, a key reason that I ran for Congress was to, indeed, protect the taxpayers, look out for the taxpayers, make sure that the government programs that are so worthy are handled well.

At this time, I yield such time as he may consume to the Congressman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. Chairman, let's be clear what we are doing here: we are not cutting anything. We are proposing to do less of an increase in this bill than what has been proposed by the majority party.

Just to illustrate, as I have done before, what I will do again, because I keep hearing talk about cuts: one equals one; two is more than one, even if you want three. This bill, what we have proposed is to have two, is to spend more than the one that was spent before, to spend two. There are some people who would like to spend three. We think that's too much.

We think that we have a deficit. We think that we have seen the majority party propose to increase taxes by however much money they happen to spend. We think they should spend less. We think government should spend less so that the taxpayers can keep more of their own money that they earned.

Mr. Chairman, we can get this budget under control. We can get this deficit under control without cutting spending and without raising taxes, if we just

control how much we increase the spending by.

Instead of increasing it by 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 percent, 9, over 9 percent, which overall has been proposed in this budget, if, instead, we only increase it by 6, not a bad increase, but just increase it by 6, and we do that year after year, we will eliminate this deficit without digging more into the taxpayers' pockets, because we already dig into their pockets too much.

So that's what this whole debate, that's what the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina is about, just controlling the growth of spending to something that is reasonable but manageable and will enable people to keep their own money and this government to return to a fiscal responsibility position without deficits.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, we have had a lot of debate and discussion about this legislation over the last 2 days. I certainly have tried to emphasize that it represents an investment in this country. Some of that investment is represented by cuts we made, over 50 cuts in programs we did not feel were commensurate with the value of the monies that the taxpayers have sent to the United States Government.

Many of those other dollars have been invested in programs we believe inure to the benefit of people's health and safety, to the movement of commerce and to the growth of our economy.

I am going to be the last speaker on our side on this amendment and would conclude in another vein, and that is the national security of our country. I think most people, when they look at the Department of Energy, believe that you have a Department that spends all of its money on energy and energy research.

As our colleagues know, this simply is not true. Only $1 out of about every $10 inure to that purpose. Most of it deals with cleaning up nuclear waste. Much of it is keeping our nuclear arsenal secure, as well as making sure that it is safe and reliable.

Our national security is at stake when we consider many of the elements in this bill. We are charged in this subcommittee to try to make wise decisions as to what pertains to people and this country's security and what does not.

I would draw attention to a fundamental issue that affects every one of us, and that is the possibility of the nuclear conflict. There is a proposal pending by the administration to build a new nuclear weapon.

We had to make what I think is a very profound decision on behalf of the people of this country as to what course of action should we take. We decided, in a bipartisan fashion on this subcommittee, to not proceed for a number of reasons. One is essentially what the perspective of our allies and those who do not have our interests at heart internationally would be if we proceed.

In testimony before the subcommittee, former chairman of the Armed Services Committee in the Senate, Sam Nunn, who is only one of two people I have ever met in my 57 years who has been nominated for a Nobel Peace Prize, the other being my senior Senator in Indiana, Senator LUGAR, said that on the RRW itself, the new nuclear weapon, if Congress gives a green light to this in our current world environment, I believe this will be misunderstood by our allies, exploited by our adversaries, complicate our work to prevent the spread and the use of nuclear weapons. I will not fund additional work on RRW at this time.

Another concern we had on the subcommittee is what is our strategy for the use or, hopefully not the use, of those weapons, as well as our strategy as far as eliminating weapons internationally. We have not developed as a Nation and as a government a new strategy subsequent to the end of the Cold War. We have had regional conflicts thereafter in policies like Kosovo. We have had the events of 9/11, and we find ourselves in conflict the most today.

We should have a broad national policy, not the policy of the Bush administration or any administration, but a national policy that stands the test of time through various administrations, as our last one did for half a century, and a strategy that also lasts through Congresses controlled by Republicans, Congresses controlled by Democrats over a generation; and that strategy does not exist.

I am very heartened that the Armed Services Committee, under the leadership, particularly, of Subcommittee Chairman TAUSCHER, as well as her ranking member, Mr. EVERETT, on your side of the aisle, has asked for a commission to study that very issue.

I am also very concerned that in the past, beginning in the late 1990s, the taxpayers of this country have been asked to invest billions of dollars in the so-called Stockpile Stewardship Program that I support. It is to ensure this we do not have to perform nuclear tests, but to ensure the safety and reliability of our nuclear weapons.

But we were also told, by several administrations of both parties and by the Department of Energy for over a decade, that we need the National Ignition Facility built. Well, it's 6 years behind schedule, and it's 226 percent over budget by a factor of $2.428 billion.

We were told by several administrations and the Department of Energy, both parties, that we need the Microsystems Science Engineering and Applications Lab at Sandia National Laboratory. That is currently 29.5 percent over budget.

We were told by administrations of both parties that we need a dual-axis radiographic hydrotest facility. That is now 6 years behind. That is 35 percent over budget. None of them have been completed. None of them are going to come in on time.

□ 1615

I would grant that the Advanced Simulation and Computational Initiative has taken hold and has produced results and has been a valuable investment.

To now, after more than a decade of investment that has not come to total fruition, to make a hard turn in the road and start spending new money on new construction without a strategy would be a mistake. And this subcommittee has made a determination not to waste the American taxpayers' dollars on that project.

We have asked, and it began 2 years ago under the leadership of then-Chairman HOBSON, that we have an arsenal of 10,000 nuclear warheads, we have a Cold War complex. We need to rationalize and, in effect, downsize that to meet the new threats to make sure that we are nimble, that we are safe, and that we save the taxpayers as much money as possible.

The administration has come back in and said, well, let us build a new nuclear weapon by 2012. And you know what? We're going to take care of the rationalization of the complex, and we're going to downsize and we're going to do that in 2030.

My point is, I wish the administration and, in this case particularly, the Department of Energy, had as much aggression and commitment to downsizing the complex as they do on developing a weapon.

And what they also would suggest that we do, before we downsize is, well, let's begin construction of this new nuclear weapon in the existing complex. So now we will have the old and we will have the new. And I think everyone, Mr. Chairman, knows the end of that story. Nothing will ever change.

It's hard to attach an exact dollar and figure on that critical issue of our national security. But many of the dollars we have saved and not spent, and we have cut in this bill, is to make sure that we take the right approach as far as our nuclear strategy and our nuclear safety, and I am very proud of that.

I see the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) on his feet. And if he would want time, I would be happy to yield to him.

Mr. HOBSON. I just wanted to take a moment to comment that I really appreciate the Chairman's very thoughtful comments, especially on all the issues that he talked about, but certainly, when it comes to NNSA and the lack of management of the weapons systems.

The gentleman remarked to me over here, do we have 9,000 weapons, or 10,000 weapons? Well, the number we've been trying to get out for a long time, cause it's a good news story. But we can't tell you here how good news the story is, because it's still secure. And we've tried for a number of years to get

out this issue of how many weapons we have and to get this complex sized appropriately.

But we're very disturbed, in a bipartisan way, about the management of the entire Department of Energy. And I want to associate myself with the gentleman's comments and his opposition to the amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. And Mr. Chairman, I want people to truly appreciate Mr. HOBSON's dedication as a member of not only this subcommittee, and as chairman for 4 years, but as a member of the Defense Subcommittee when there was a similar proposal several years ago and he thought it was the incorrect proposal. He stopped what I think was incorrect public policy from taking place. He saved the taxpayers of this country money.

And the only reason today I believe we have even a 20–30 proposition from the administration as far as downsizing the complex, that I find totally unsatisfactory but at least it is a proposal, is because of the work that Mr. HOBSON did. And I thank him for that very much, and do ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. 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 South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HINCHEY

Mr. HINCHEY. 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. HINCHEY:

Page 40, after line 18, insert the following:

SEC. 503. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Secretary of Energy to designate any geographic area as a national interest electric transmission corridor under section 216(a) of the Federal Power Act (as added by section 1221 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005), and none of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to take any action related to the processing or issuance of a permit under section 216(b) of the Federal Power Act.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to extend my appreciation and gratitude to Chairman VISCLOSKY and Ranking Member HOBSON for putting together a very fine bill.

However, what we want to do is oppose a certain part of this, denying funding for monopolistic corporations to impede upon States rights and people's private personal proper rights. It's an important amendment and I ask everyone to consider it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, this is going to be the only vote that you're going to have on this issue. When the power lines are coming through your district, and this is coming through your district, how will you explain to your constituents, to your neighbors, your friends, your local elected officials, your farmers, that you had a chance to slow this down and you didn't do it?

How are you going to tell them that you sided with the power companies and not with the citizens?

This is a time out. It will give us a chance to reexamine the process.

These corridors divide communities, neighborhoods. They destroy landscapes. In fact, the current corridor in the Mid-Atlantic includes Antietam, where 20,000 people died in 1 day. We need to make sure that we take time to do it right, and don't bow to the scare tactics and the false Dear Colleague letters.

This is your first and likely your only vote on this issue. Don't let this vote come back to haunt you. Voting against the Hinchey amendment means you don't want to make sure these corridors are sited properly.

I strongly urge the Members to vote aye for the Hinchey amendment.

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

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the Hinchey-Wolf amendment to force the DOE to take a time-out from its rush to subject giant stretches of this country to eminent domain for energy interests.

In my State, in my district, the New York Regional Interconnect, for instance, NIRE, is an internationally financed private entity which will receive eminent domain rights to seize private land for private profit. It would remove the State environmental review process and all property rights and States rights from the equation and give that all to FERC. I think this is something that needs much closer examination.

New York City, I would reassure my colleagues from downstate, does not need NIRE to have power, especially not this route. In fact, there are alternate routes that the State could and would look at if it had the time that it would normally have under CCRA.

I urge support for the Hinchey-Wolf amendment in the interest of property rights and States rights.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts rise as the designee of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. OLVER. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Member from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Hinchey-Wolf amendment.

Today, more than ever, America needs a transmission grid that will deliver reliable and affordable electricity to consumers across the Nation. The Energy Information Agency projects that electricity consumption will increase 43 percent by 2030. Other studies project growth and demand to grow by 19 percent over the next 10 years, while power capacity will grow by only 6 percent over that same time. It stands to reason we're going to have to move power where we have excess to where we need it.

Recognizing the fact the Energy Policy Act of 2005, EPACT, allowed for the designation of national interest corridors where congestion in the electricity grid is jeopardizing reliable service and raising the cost to electricity consumers, this designation is not a mandate that a transmission line be built but, instead, an incentive for stakeholders to address the grid capacity issues. FERC is authorized to get involved only if the State is unwilling to or cannot act, then only after exhaustive Federal considerations.

The Hinchey-Wolf amendment, unfortunately, seeks to block funding for the National Electricity Transmission Corridors as contained in the authorizing legislation. Failing to address congestion and transmission infrastructure will do absolutely nothing for electricity consumers who will see their energy bills continue to climb in the future. And more blackouts.

Our constituents deserve a robust energy transmission infrastructure, and EPACT encourages congested States to resolve the problems in a timely manner. And we know the issue of blackouts, particularly in mid-America to the Northeast.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Hinchey-Wolf amendment because all it will do is raise electric prices because we can't move power where we really need it.

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of this amendment. And I'd like to start off by saying to my colleague that I respect a great deal from Texas, this amendment is not about sharing power. It's not about giving power from one part of the country to another. It's about how do we do it. Do we do it in a thoughtful way? Do we do it in a reasonable way? Or do we do it in a way by using eminent domain, by running high power lines over people's land, by taking people's land? Is that the American way? Is that the way we want to have our energy policy dictated to the States and the localities? I think not.

I think there is a better way to do it. There is a more thoughtful way to do it. We are facing such a plan in New York, and it's ill-conceived and poorly thought out. And that's not the way we should be running our energy policy in this country. It should be in a more thoughtful way.

I strongly support this amendment because we need to stand up to the power companies and not let them take our land and not let them run power lines over people's property.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to yield 2 minutes to a member of the committee, Mr. PETERSON.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I think this is one of the more important amendments we're going to deal with today.

America needs available power, and especially electric power. We have a system that has not worked. The legislation doesn't give the Federal Government the right to usurp States rights. It only gets involved when multiple States can't get their job done. I was in State government for 19 years, and I wouldn't bet the farm on four PUCs adequately performing on a time basis so we could connect our grid.

Here's what Bill Richardson said in 2001. ''The United States has a first-rate economy. We're the Superpower of the world, the best military, a booming technological economy, but we've got a grid that is antiquated, that is Third World, that needs beefing up. We've got very weak power transmission lines to connect our generation capacity.''

And here's what Sam Bodman said in 2006, a year ago. ''The Nation is currently facing serious near problems in adequately delivering electricity to its customers.''

It means we have to fix the grid. And we've been unable to get States to work together collectively. This is a process that only kicks in when the States can't get their job done.

Connecting this country is a national issue. I don't want my State in charge of the national grid. I had a Governor's person come into my office protesting a power line that was proposed. It had been off of the table by the PGM for a year and a half and they didn't even know it. It wasn't even up for consideration. And the three States that were involved in the little piece that was left was not that State.

Folks, there's a lot of disinformation out here. The connectivity of our electric system is vital to our economic future and we need a process. This was put in the energy bill because it wasn't working, because we couldn't upgrade our grid.

And two Secretaries of Energy and leaders across this country, the Edison Institute, all say, don't pass this amendment.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

□ 1630

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, it is pretty clear from the record of their activities that the Department of Energy has been in cahoots with the electric utilities and they are running roughshod over Americans everywhere.

My subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Domestic Policy, held a hearing on this exact matter, and we heard about concerns about the law and about the Department of Energy's implementation.

These concerns include whether the Department of Energy would take into account the protection of national parks, State parks, conservation easements, and historical sites like battlefields when determining where an electric transmission corridor should be designated. The answer is they don't.

Whether the Department of Energy is considering the effects of a corridor designation on the private property rights of landowners. They did not.

Whether the Department is considering the environmental impact of corridor designations. The answer is they did not.

Whether the Department of Energy is considering alternatives to constructing new electric transmission lines, like demand-side management, distributed generation, and energy efficiency. They did not.

Whether the Department has adequately considered the actual benefit utility consumers would receive. They did not.

Support the Hinchey amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment.

The 2005 energy law required the Department of Energy to identify geographical areas throughout the country where congestion in the electric grid is raising prices and creating reliability concerns.

Ladies and gentlemen, I don't think I have to tell anybody here on the floor that we have an energy crisis in this country, and there are a host of reasons why we have an energy crisis in this country. And I think most of us understand that, frankly, there is not one silver bullet that is going to resolve these issues.

The designation of this 2005 energy law creates interest of corridors, clearly vests States with the primary responsibility for siting transmission lines and considering what local or regional benefits and consequences exist.

I think it is clear that in the 2005 law that we are seeking to amend here that the national designation does not, does not, usurp State authority for siting transmission lines. Yet we have a lot of challenges on a regional basis.

In California we are attempting to try to work with Arizona to the mutual benefit of citizens living in both States to try to allow for the conductivity of that energy back and forth as well as to try to maintain the stability of much-needed electricity for our constituents in the Southwest.

This amendment, I think, would do great harm to that. And that is precisely why I think the 2005 law was designed to address short-sighted and narrow interests blocking the public good.

I ask that you reject this amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition of this amendment.

As a member of the Energy Committee, I want to debunk a couple of myths that have been perpetrated today in the debate. First of all, that this was done hastily and thoughtlessly. The fact of the matter is the issue of the transmission of electricity has been an issue for many years. Many hearings have been held, much debate. It was part of the Energy Act. What we have to do is resolve the issue how we get energy from generator A to consumer B. In between we have to figure out how to do that.

Myth number two is that this runs roughshod over States' and communities' rights. The reality is that they are involved in the process. They are involved in working with FERC, and FERC has to work with them on the siting issues. And only when there is a conflict do they get to break that conflict by rising above it.

We in this Nation have to figure out how we get electricity from point A to consumer B. Think of this corridor as a transportation highway. And when we think of it as a highway, we understand why we have to do it this way.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR).

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

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hinchey amendment.

In Arizona, which is one of the fastest-growing States, we, as a growing State, have enough energy and power to meet the power needs of our State. But what has happened is that since California has a moratorium on building generating plants, the tendency is to have power plants be built in Arizona to generate power and then power lines to be taken into California.

Very recently, about 1½ months ago, the Arizona State Corporation Commission, which has the responsibility for siting the power lines, rejected, and it was an issue of local control in that the power lines that were being proposed would have endangered the wildlife. There were problems with the enhancement features of our land.

The issue for me is local control; so that is why I support the Hinchey amendment.

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Chairman, again, I rise in very strong opposition to this bill.

This bill does so few things in terms of getting power to where it needs to be. They talk about the fact that the original 1221 was intended to help get power to places that need it to help alleviate congestion. But, in fact, the NYRI proposal in New York State does nothing whatsoever to prevent congestion. Rather, it does more to create congestion than to alleviate it.

I strongly support the Hinchey-Wolf amendment because I believe that using eminent domain to take people's property in order to run power lines over it is the wrong thing. It is not the American way. It is not what we came to Congress for. And I strongly oppose that.

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

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

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to point out, in response to a couple of remarks that were made, this project that Mr. ARCURI, Mr. HINCHEY, and I are concerned with, which could happen anywhere in the country to any of you, is not an interstate project. It occurs entirely within New York State, mysteriously starting in Utica and mysteriously ending in the little town of Campbell Hall. The other shoes have not dropped yet. But in New York State's Environmental Quality Review Act, nothing gets approved in under a year.

The proposal in section 1221 that after a year it kicks up authority to FERC is patently meant to usurp State authority. You can't get a subdivision, a power plant, a landfill, hardly any public project approved that fast. It usually takes a draft environmental impact statement; public comment; a final environmental impact statement; and at long last, approval. But two years is the shortest that I have ever seen. So to have this be one year means to me that the law was written to usurp State authority.

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

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment barring funding in this bill to be used to designate any area as a ''national interest electric transmission corridor,'' or a NIET. NIET designation and the corresponding authority that has been given to FERC blatantly usurps States rights to designate and site transmission lines in accordance with what is best for its citizenry. There is a well-established successful history of States executing this authority, and there is no real reason to take it away.

I understand there needs to be a holistic approach to our energy policy, but absent clear and definitive reasons to grant this authority to FERC, why are we allowing this Federal entity to circumvent State siting decisions, State comprehensive energy plans, and State efforts to promote energy efficiency and independence? It is clear more analysis and consideration is needed.

This amendment would not strike this provision forever. Rather, it would allow us more time to have debate, oversight, and public comment on the issue. When this provision was passed in the last Congress by the Senate and signed into law, it was a small piece of a broad energy overhaul. It received no debate on this floor and no vote in this body. Now, with the prospect of towering transmission lines running through 214 counties in 11 States across our Nation, and that is just the first chapter, we must take a time out to reexamine this provision.

What will you tell your constituents when these towering lines are denied by your State regulators, but mandated by FERC? You had your vote today and you need to vote for this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. Vote ''yes'' to allow us to give needed consideration to the broad ramifications of proposed NIET corridors and ensure that the rights of States are not unduly trampled.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

Mr. WALSH of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

Section 1221 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 is an abridgement of the rights of State and local governments to influence Federal policy as it pertains to their communities. In fact, section 1221, regarding the siting of overhead electricity transmission lines, permits the FERC to outright ignore State decisions and local considerations.

We are elected to represent a select constituency and our States, to advocate for their needs, and to advance our national interest. In this instance those responsibilities collide.

I recognize that the Federal Government can and should do more to modernize our Nation's aging and congested electric power infrastructure. But the Northeast corridor proposal negatively impacts the environment, decreases property values, poses health risks, and hurts local property tax revenue. What is worse is that it provides State and local regulatory agencies no ability to involve themselves.

By failing to support this amendment, Members of Congress will, in essence, allow unknown bureaucrats in Washington, huddled around a faceless map, to make critical decisions that affect the lives and financial well-being of thousands of American families. Surely that wasn't our Founding Fathers' intent. There has to be a better way than to circumvent a State's decisions and disregard property owners' rights. By supporting this amendment, we create time to find that better way.

Mr. HOBSON. Might I inquire how much time I have left.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HOBSON. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. Chairman, I might say I am doing this out of courtesy to these gentlemen. I happen to oppose the amendment, but I think they have a right to be heard.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman.

We are not asking for a repeal. We are asking for time.

Again, this section, and it is amazing, was never voted on in the House. The power industry lobbyists have been roaming this Hill. Your constituents are back in their districts expecting you to represent them.

□ 1645

The corridor goes over and includes Gettysburg, where Lincoln gave the Gettysburg Address. Antietam, 20,000 people died. No environmental impact statement. No consideration of energy efficiency technology. No consideration for historic lands. It is an assault on property rights.

In the last Congress, we all got worked up on the Kelo decision. This is, in essence, whereby they can do this. And someone said, well, you go through the State. The power companies won't really try to go through the States. They will pro forma it, knowing that they can go to FERC and FERC will do it.

Here's what the FERC administrator said: ''The authority to lawfully deny a permit is critically important to the States for ensuring that the interests of the local communities and the citizens are protected.''

What the Commission does today, it's a significant inroad in traditional State transmission citing authority. It gives States two options: Either issue a permit, or we will do it for them. Obviously, there is no choice.

I strongly urge, in the interest of all these things we're talking about, a vote for the Hinchey amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I have 3½ minutes left and understand I have the right to close. What I would like to do is to yield that 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New York before he seeks recognition, and would simply emphasize to the membership that I am doing this as a courtesy. I am in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. But I would yield my remaining time to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HINCHEY. I want to express my deep appreciation to Chairman VISCLOSKY, not just for his excellent work in putting this appropriations bill together, but also for yielding me this time.

It's important for every Member of this House to focus their attention on what is happening here and what we are trying to do.

What we are dealing with here in the context of this appropriations bill, which, if this amendment is successful, will function out there for only 1 year, what we are attempting to deal with is an obscure provision in the 2005 Energy Policy Act, which hardly any Member of this House, I bet, understood when that bill was passed because of the obscurity of this provision.

What does this provision do? This provision tramples on States rights. It says if any State, any State in the Nation is unable to agree to a location for a high-tension transmission line, or if they stipulate that certain corrections have to be made, if that takes more than 1 year, which it would in almost every case, then the Federal Energy Agency steps in and they designate where the corridor will go, overriding States rights. I believe that this provision is contrary to a very significant provision in the United States Constitution, and this provision overrides States rights. That alone is good reason to vote for this amendment.

But beyond that, that provision in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, which this amendment would stop in its tracks for just 1 year so that we could give it further consideration, that provision stipulates that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission can exercise eminent domain on people's private personal property. That means that FERC can condemn anyone's private personal property in order to establish one of these high-tension transmission corridors. That in itself is bad enough.

But that provision in the Energy Policy Act of 2005 goes even further. It says that FERC, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, can grant that power of condemnation of individual citizens' private personal property rights to a private corporation so that the private corporation can now go in and declare eminent domain and condemn people's private personal property.

This provision in this Energy Policy Act overrides States rights and the individual rights of private American citizens. It was put in there inappropriately. Hardly anybody was aware of it when that bill passed. Many of us voted against it nevertheless. Still, it is part of the law.

What we are saying here in this amendment to this appropriations bill is give us another year to look at this issue. Let this issue be considered more carefully. We should not have this kind of impediment against States rights and people's private personal property rights.

I ask you, on behalf of all of your constituents, please join us in support of this amendment.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, those of us who lived through the brown-outs and rolling black-outs during the California energy crisis remember well how difficult the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission was to deal with, and it pains me to vote for a national policy that I hope will not need to be used.

However, after carefully reviewing the issue, I do not see a better alternative. My vote is a vote to keep the lights on in Southern California.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hinchey-Wolf amendment and thank the authors for highlighting Section 1221 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, which could allow DOE to designate large transmission corridors across the country and override States' decisions about transmission line placement.

Mr. Chairman, we all recognize that the energy requirements of our growing economy will place increasing demands on existing transmission facilities. In this regard, modernization is an important goal.

But we want to make certain that our State, county and local communities are fully engaged in the process to determine where transmission lines are located. Local leaders and property-owners have the clearest view of how these lines will affect their communities.

The goal of this amendment is to allow additional time for consideration of DOE and FERC's implementation process, so that there will be more complete deliberation and consideration of this potential regulation.

Municipal, county, and State officials want and need to be full partners in the process that leads to the siting of new transmission lines.

I urge support of the Hinchey-Wolf amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. HINCHEY. 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 New York will be postponed.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to comment on the last speaker from New York about States rights and private property rights.

The taking of land is dear to me. And this Congress took 147 million acres of land in 1980 and made it into wilderness, parks and refuges. I bring that up because, of that 147, 27 of them were picked by the State. But we did it. That was private property.

But I am, Mr. Chairman, dismayed by this Congress, including Members of my own party, who voted today to eliminate funding for the Denali Commission and cripple the economic life to hundreds of small and impoverished communities throughout rural Alaska.

I am standing here today in the well defending the funding for the Denali Commission because the Federal Government has, time and time again, as I mentioned, limited the ability of Alaskans to provide for themselves. We have trillions of dollars' worth of resources in our State; we haven't been able to produce them. This Congress has said no to ANWR. Many of the speakers who just spoke voted no on ANWR, no to any new mining, no to more Alaskan oil and natural gas. Not letting Alaskans provide for themselves is economic terrorism by this body.

We sent over 15.5 billion barrels of oil through the pipeline. At today's prices, that's equivalent to $1.1 trillion. We have trillions of dollars' worth more of energy. If the State were allowed to manage its own resources, we wouldn't need the commission. And we wouldn't be sending trillions of American dollars overseas, to countries that hate us, for the energy Americans could be producing at home.

Unfortunately, energy ignorance in this body is increasing almost as fast as our dependence on foreign oil. Until Alaska is permitted to produce its own resources for themselves and for America, Alaskans will need the Denali Commission.

In 1998, Congress passed the Denali Commission Act. It provides job training and other economic development services for rural communities, chiefly in troubled communities, where unemployment exceeds 50 percent. It promotes rural development by providing power generation and transmission facilities, modern communication systems, water and sewer systems, and other infrastructure needs.

To give you an idea, my State of Alaska is 656,425 square miles, more than twice the size of Texas. Individual Alaskans own less than 1 percent of their land. The Federal Government owns over 60 percent. Flush toilets are just a luxury, and the Denali Commission tries to provide good sanitation to all Alaskans that do not have the ability to have potable water or remove the sewage they create. The fact is, I doubt if any of you have ever heard of a honey bucket.

How many of my colleagues have communities in their districts with no water and sewer? Well, Mr. Chairman, I have several. The Denali Commission has brought these systems to many of my rural communities, but there are still over 150 areas that suffer from poor sanitation and a lack of safe drinking water.

There are rural communities that are completely isolated, and my Alaskans can only get to and from their homes by boat or by small plane. There are no roads connecting these communities outside of Anchorage and Fairbanks.

The Commission also works carefully to ensure these communities have telephones, a reliable supply of electricity, and in some cases, Internet access.

Mr. Chairman, these are all things we in the Lower 48 take for granted, but for thousands of Alaskans they are luxuries.

In 2006, the Denali Commission leveraged its funding to develop basic infrastructure in over 100 Alaska communities. It invested money towards replacing aging fuel tanks and upgrading rural power plants, while at the same time pushing for wind generation, hydro, geothermal and biomass energy projects.

In addition to constructing several essential village primary care clinics, the Denali Commission funded major design initiatives for needed replacement hospitals in Nome and Barrow. It has now completed clinics in over 65 of these remote communities.

The Commission also provided funding to construct housing for teachers in nine frontier communities, which is essential for recruiting and retaining teachers to the remote areas of my State. The Commission worked tirelessly each year to make sure that my Alaskans are not treated like second-class citizens. The amendment will cripple the Denali Commission's ability to provide these basic resources and cripple many rural communities that are already on crutches.

Mr. Chairman, I can say this respectfully for one thing. We talk a lot about the economics of this Nation and energy. This Congress has lacked in a positive way. I am deeply disturbed that this amendment was adopted by my own party and by the opposite party. I hope you reconsider this when we go to conference.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

An amendment by Mr. PORTER of Nevada.

Amendment No. 18 by Ms. FOXX of North Carolina.

An amendment by Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

Amendment No. 17 by Mr. NEUGEBAUER of Texas.

Amendment No. 9 by Mrs. MUSGRAVE of Colorado.

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. BISHOP of New York.

Amendment No. 14 by Mr. JORDAN of Ohio.

An amendment by Mr. SHADEGG of Arizona.

Amendment No. 12 by Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

Amendment No. 15 by Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

An amendment by Mr. HINCHEY of New York.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PORTER

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PORTER:

Page 21, strike line 22 and all that follows through page 24, line 9.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 80, noes 351, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 516]

AYES—80

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Capps
Chandler
Christensen
Cohen
Conyers
Crowley
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Doggett
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Gallegly
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gohmert
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Harman
Heller
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jones (OH)
Kucinich
Lantos
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Markey
Matheson
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
Meehan
Miller, George
Nadler
Pallone
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Porter
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rothman
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schiff
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Souder
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velázquez
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—351

Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeGette
Delahunt
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
English (PA)
Etheridge
Everett
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hare
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pascrell
Pastor
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Towns
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Bean
Becerra
Davis, Jo Ann
Diaz-Balart, M.
Ortiz
Sullivan

□ 1724

Ms. ROYBALL-ALLARD, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mrs. CAPITO and Messrs. LARSON of Connecticut, REYNOLDS, BROWN of South Carolina, KILDEE, RUPPERSBERGER, SHULER, WALDEN of Oregon, TOWNS, TOM DAVIS of Virginia and ELLISON changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LEE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Messrs. THOMPSON of California, PALLONE, ALEXANDER, BERMAN, RODRIGUEZ, GRIJALVA, ENGEL, SIRES, MCDERMOTT, JACKSON of Illinois, WEINER, MEEHAN, CONYERS, COHEN, LANTOS and CAMPBELL of

California changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 134, noes 293, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 517]

AYES—134

Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Chabot
Coble
Conaway
Cooper
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ellsworth
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Lamborn
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Ramstad
Rehberg
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Tancredo
Terry
Tiahrt
Upton
Walberg
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Young (FL)

NOES—293

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—10

Becerra
Blunt
Davis, Jo Ann
Obey
Ortiz
Payne
Radanovich
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1727

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL OF NEW MEXICO

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 121, noes 312, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 518]

AYES—121

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Andrews
Bachmann
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Berkley
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blunt
Boehner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Cole (OK)
Cubin
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Duncan
Fallin
Feeney
Filner
Flake
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Graves
Hall (TX)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Issa
Jindal
Jordan
Kind
King (NY)
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
Melancon
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Price (GA)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rogers (MI)
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Scott (VA)
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Souder
Space
Stearns
Tancredo
Thompson (CA)
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wilson (NM)

NOES—312

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bordallo
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)

Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Giffords
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Becerra
Davis, Jo Ann
Ortiz
Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1734

Messrs. CROWLEY, MOORE of Kansas, THOMPSON of Mississippi, TOM DAVIS of Virginia and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. BOOZMAN, MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida and MORAN of Kansas changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. NEUGEBAUER

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 133, noes 298, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 519]

AYES—133

Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blunt
Boehner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Conaway
Cooper
Culberson
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doggett
Doolittle
Dreier
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Fortuño
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gohmert
Granger
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Lamborn
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rehberg
Reichert
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Stearns
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—298

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly
Doyle
Drake
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—6

Becerra
Davis, Jo Ann
Gutierrez
Larsen (WA)
Ortiz
Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1738

Mr. PICKERING changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MRS. MUSGRAVE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 166, noes 267, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 520]

AYES—166

Aderholt
Akin
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ellsworth
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kagen
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Lamborn
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Patrick
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—267

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gallegly
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—4

Becerra
Davis, Jo Ann
Ortiz
Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1743

Mr. SALI and Mr. HUNTER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 146, noes 285, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 521]

AYES—146

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (NY)
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carney
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Courtney
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Doggett
Donnelly
Emanuel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gillibrand
Green, Al
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kagen
Kennedy
Kind
Kingston
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Solis
Space
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Velázquez
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Waxman
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (SC)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—285

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeGette
Delahunt
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meek (FL)
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Pastor
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
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
Roskam
Ross
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Scott (GA)
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Waters
Watt
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

McCarthy (NY)

NOT VOTING—5

Becerra
Davis, Jo Ann
Ortiz
Paul
Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1749

Mr. GRAVES changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. JORDAN OF OHIO

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 129, noes 301, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 522]

AYES—129

Akin
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, M.
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Forbes
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kagen
Keller
King (IA)
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reynolds
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Tancredo
Terry
Tiberi
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)

NOES—301

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield

Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Becerra
Davis, Jo Ann
Flake
McCrery
Ortiz
Paul
Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1752

Mr. MARCHANT changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHADEGG

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 157, noes 274, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 523]

AYES—157

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Costa
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Fallin
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Towns
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—274

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Camp (MI)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Wicker
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Becerra
Davis, Jo Ann
Feeney
Ortiz
Paul
Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). One minute remains on this vote.

□ 1757

Mrs. MYRICK changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 158, noes 275, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 524]

AYES—158

Aderholt
Akin
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kagen
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Patrick
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions

Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Young (FL)

NOES—275

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—4

Becerra
Davis, Jo Ann
Ortiz
Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1801

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. WILSON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 138, noes 295, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 525]

AYES—138

Aderholt
Akin
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kagen
Keller
King (IA)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Lamborn
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)

NOES—295

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf

Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Becerra
Davis, Jo Ann
Ortiz
Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1806

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HINCHEY

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 257, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 526]

AYES—174

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baird
Baldwin
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Conyers
Courtney
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Doggett
Donnelly
Drake
Ellison
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortuño
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Jones (NC)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kind
Kirk
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Langevin
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Perlmutter
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Porter
Price (NC)
Ramstad
Reichert
Rodriguez
Rothman
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Walsh (NY)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch (VT)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOES—257

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Chabot
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (AL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Gene
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Honda
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Issa
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Poe
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schiff
Schmidt
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Stearns
Sutton
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Towns
Turner
Upton
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Becerra
Davis, Jo Ann
Diaz-Balart, L.
Jones (OH)
Ortiz
Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1810

Mr. GUTIERREZ changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in strong support of H.R. 2641, the ''Energy and Water Appropriations Act of 2007.'' I also rise to express my sincere appreciation to Mr. VISCLOSKY, the chairman of the Energy and Water Subcommittee and his Ranking Member, Mr. HOBSON of Ohio, for working together in a constructive effort to renew America's dependence on foreign oil and cutting greenhouse gas emissions.

Moreover, this bill merits our support because it increases the Nation's commitment to long-term basic research by increasing the Federal investment that is so critical to developing the next generation of scientific breakthroughs. Federal funding for research and development has declined steadily over the last decade, and sound science has been compromised by political interference. This legislation takes a giant step toward reversing this disturbing trend.

Mr. Chairman, in the 1970s, our Nation faced an energy crisis unlike any we had ever experienced before. The OPEC oil embargo of 1973 led to skyrocketing prices, long gas lines, gas sales only every other day, and shortages where gas was simply unavailable. We experienced another oil shock in the late 1970s and under the leadership of President Jimmy Carter, America responded with unprecedented initiatives for energy research. But over the years, gas prices came down, incentive was lost, and these efforts fell by the wayside.

Today, we again face an energy crisis, only this time it is coupled with the enormous challenge of addressing the reality of global climate change. H.R. 2641 attempts to face these twin crises with over three billion dollars to address global climate change—researching its effects and working on technologies to slow it down—and investment in renewable energy programs that both reduce greenhouse gases and help our Nation meet its energy needs.

The bill cuts funding for poorly thought-out plans for nuclear weapons recognizing that because of the enormous cost and the importance to our national security they require smart strategies not blank checks. Instead it works to keep Americans safe with a 75 percent increase in funding for nuclear non-proliferation efforts. It also funds the Army Corps of Engineers, strengthening our Nation's navigation infrastructure and improving flood control programs.

Before I highlight some of the more attractive provisions of this legislation, which by the way contains no earmarks, let me explain briefly why this energy and water legislation is so near and dear to the people I represent in the 18th Congressional District of Texas.

In the past 2 years, Houston, the center of my district, has experienced some of the most devastating acts of nature in its history.

Six years ago this month, in June 2001, Tropical Storm Allison hit Southeast Texas. Until Hurricane Katrina, this storm would become the costliest tropical storm in U.S. history. Flash flooding initiated quite rapidly during Houston's rush hour late Friday afternoon and on into the evening hours. Widespread street flooding was the initial threat, but the high rainfall amounts forced almost all the major Houston area bayou systems into severe flooding, with some to record levels. All major freeways in the Houston area were severely flooded at at least one location during this event. During this single event alone, rainfall in Harris County ranged from just 2 inches in the extreme west to in excess of 20 inches over Green's Bayou in the east. Countywide, the average rainfall was 8 inches with over two-thirds of the county receiving over 10 inches.

The total damage across Southeast Texas approached $5 billion ($4.88 billion in Harris County alone). Twenty-two deaths were caused by Allison, with each of these fatalities occurred in Harris County. At this time, thunderstorms began to train and merge across the Houston metro area, and the system evolved into a powerful complex right over the most populated portion of our CWA that evening. This complex progressed south and east into the early morning hours of Saturday, June 9. Very heavy rainfall was observed for up to 10 hours in some locations, and rainfall rates of 4 inches or more per hour were observed throughout the night. A station in northeast Houston recorded over 26 inches of rain in almost 10 hours.

In response, the Tropical Storm Allison Recovery Project was launched. TSARP is a joint study effort by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, and the Harris County Flood Control District, the District. The purpose of the TSARP project is to develop technical products that will assist the local community in recovery from the devastating flooding, and provide the community with a greater understanding of flooding and flood risks. The end product of the study is new Flood Insurance Rate Maps.

TSARP mission statement is: To assist residents of Harris County in recovery from Tropical Storm Allison and minimize damages from future floods by investigating the flood event and by developing current, accurate, and timely flood hazard information.

TSARP used state-of-the-art technology. TSARP has yielded many products that will help us better understand our flood risk. These products will assist citizens in making important decisions, and will assist public agencies in infrastructure planning. The hoped for end result of TSARP is a more informed and disaster resistant community and one that is better prepared.

Purchasing flood insurance before June 18 allowed people to ''grandfather'' their existing floodplain status and pay lower premiums for flood insurance. Once the maps became official on June 18, residents and business owners whose properties are categorized in higher-risk flood zones on the new maps may pay higher rates.

According to FEMA, a ''Regulatory Floodway'' means the channel of a river or other watercourse and the adjacent land areas that must be reserved in order to discharge the base flood without cumulatively increasing the water surface elevation more than a designated height. Communities must regulate development in these floodways to ensure that there are no increases in upstream flood elevations. For streams and other watercourses where FEMA has provided Base Flood Elevations, BFEs, but no floodway has been designated, the community must review floodplain development on a case-by-case basis to ensure that increases in water surface elevations do not occur, or identify the need to adopt a floodway if adequate information is available.

FEMA regulations say ''Communities must regulate development in these floodways to ensure that there are no increases in upstream flood elevations.'' The City of Houston interprets that as no development within the floodway. This is not necessarily correct. Construction can take place but it cannot obstruct the water. Elevating the structure gets the same effect but the city denies this as they said (debris may collect under the structure). They will only allow a remodeling permit if the improvements do not exceed 50 percent of the structures value.

There is one neighborhood along White Oak Bayou that is greatly affected. The homes are of higher value than most of the district. Alternatives to resolve their issue includes widening the bayou or diverting floodwater.

The Harris County Flood District is now investigating these alternatives. Otherwise, the only solution would be a change in the city's ordinance allowing construction in the floodway.

I am looking forward to working with colleagues on the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee to explore ways and means of resolving this problem so that Houstonians will not be forced out of their homes and unable to afford flood insurance.

Mr. Chairman, let me provide this partial listing of some of the many good provisions in this legislation. First, H.R. 2641 will improve U.S. waterways and flood protection by increasing funding for the Army Corps of Engineers by $713.4 million above the President's request to address a $1 billion backlog of operations and needed maintenance. This backlog needs to be addressed to sustain the coastal and inland navigation infrastructure critical to the U.S. economy, and the gaps in flood protection highlighted in Hurricane Katrina.

Second, the legislation will help reduce dependence on foreign oil and cut greenhouse gas emissions. Renewable energy and energy efficiency programs are funded at $1.9 billion—a 50 percent increase in energy efficiency and renewable energy programs. This is in addition to the additional $300 million added in the FY 2007 joint resolution. In contrast, the President's FY 2008 request for renewable energy and energy efficiency research is the same as it was in 2001 in real terms.

Funding for research and development of alternative fuels such as corn based and cellulosic ethanol and biodiesel is increased by 40 percent above the President's request. Solar Energy demonstration projects receive a 34 percent increase above the President's request. There is also $22 million to research new ways of generating power from water flow, and $44.3 million for geothermal energy, neither of which were funded in the President's request. (This is on top of the $95 million for upgrades to existing hydropower dams funded under the Army Corps.)

I could go on and on. This thoughtful legislation provides funding to invest in new vehicle technology; energy efficient buildings; weatherization; carbon capture and sequestration; and climate change science. And it cuts wasteful spending as well.

For example, H.R. 2641 directs the Energy Department to develop a concrete plan to improve its contract management. The Energy Department has been on the GAO list of programs that are at high-risk for waste, fraud, abuse and mismanagement for seventeen years in a row.

The bill also cuts Global Nuclear Energy Partnership, GNEP, funding by $285 million below the President's request and $47.5 million below 2007 for this initiative to reprocess spent nuclear fuel and burn long-lived radioactive materials. There are concerns that this project is unsafe, will cost tens of billions of dollars, and could make it far easier for terrorists to obtain plutonium to make nuclear weapons.

The bill also secures substantial savings by cutting wasteful and unnecessary nuclear weapons programs by $5.9 billion, $632 million below the President's request and $396 million below 2007. It cuts to 37 specific weapons program accounts, including the Reliable Replacement Warhead program. The existing stockpile will continue to provide the Nation's nuclear deterrent for the next two decades, and certainly until the President develops a strategic nuclear weapons plan to transform the nuclear weapons complex away from its expensive Cold War configuration to a more affordable, sustainable structure.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 2641 and urge my colleagues to join me. I thank Chairman VISCLOSKY for his fine work in bringing this exceptional legislation to the House floor where it should receive an overwhelmingly favorable vote.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE) having assumed the chair, Mr. ANDREWS, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2641) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EMMETT TILL UNSOLVED CIVIL RIGHTS CRIME ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the title to H.R. 923 is amended so as to read: ''A bill to provide for the investigation of certain unsolved civil rights crimes, and for other purposes.''.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2764,