(B) developed a deep and abiding dedication to the values of the public land of the United States;

(2) during his 18-year tenure in Congress, including service in both the Senate and the House of Representatives, Craig Thomas forged a distinguished legislative record on issues as diverse as public land management, agriculture, fiscal responsibility, and rural health care;

(3) as Chairman and Ranking Member of the National Parks Subcommittee of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and a frequent visitor to many units of the National Park System, including Yellowstone National Park and Grand Teton National Park, Craig Thomas was a strong proponent for ensuring that people of all ages and abilities had a wide range of opportunities to learn more about the natural and cultural heritage of the United States;

(4) Craig Thomas authored legislation to provide critical funding and management reforms to protect units of the National Park System into the 21st century, ensuring quality visits to units of the National Park System and the protection of natural and cultural resources;

(5) Craig Thomas strongly supported public-private partnerships and collaboration between the National Park Service and other organizations that foster new opportunities for providing visitor services while encouraging greater citizen involvement in the stewardship of units of the National Park System;

(6) Craig Thomas was instrumental in obtaining the Federal share for a public-private partnership with the Grand Teton National Park Foundation and the Grand Teton Natural History Association to construct a new discovery and visitor center at Grand Teton National Park;

(7) on June 4, 2007, Craig Thomas passed away after battling cancer for 7 months;

(8) Craig Thomas is survived by his wife, Susan, and children, Patrick, Greg, Peter, and Lexie; and

(9) in memory of the distinguished career of service of Craig Thomas to the people of the United States, the dedication of Craig Thomas to units of the National Park System, generally, and to Grand Teton National Park, specifically, and the critical role of Craig Thomas in the new discovery and visitor center at Grand Teton National Park, the Grand Teton Discovery and Visitor Center should be designated as the ''Craig Thomas Discovery and Visitor Center''.

(b) THE CRAIG THOMAS DISCOVERY AND VISITOR CENTER.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—The Grand Teton Discovery and Visitor Center located in Moose, Wyoming, and scheduled for completion in August 2007 shall be known and designated as the ''Craig Thomas Discovery and Visitor Center''.

(2) REFERENCE.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Grand Teton Discovery and Visitor Center referred to in paragraph (1) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Craig Thomas Discovery and Visitor Center''.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

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

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 514 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. 2643.

□ 1044

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. 2643) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, Environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, with Mr. WATT (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 26, 2007, the amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 111, line 17.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

TITLE VI—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for W.A. Young & Sons Foundry, Greene County Pennsylvania.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 26, 2007, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Chair for recognition.

This amendment says, ''None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for W.A. Young & Sons Foundry, Greene County, Pennsylvania.''

The three-sentence certification letter for this project states that the purpose for this funding is to restore the machine shop at the foundry to its original likeness.

Once again, it's important to note that the certification letters that we get from the Appropriations Committee are not the request letters that Members give to the Appropriations Committee to request their earmark. So we really don't know all that much about what the earmarks are for, other than a three-sentence or a four-sentence certification letter. So I would have hoped to have had more information, but we were unable to get from the Appropriations Committee the actual request letters. So we are at a bit of a loss to find out what the earmark is really for, but we did our best to do a little research.

The W.A. Foundry is a factory that opened in 1900 and closed in 1965. The Web site that we found claimed that the W.A. Young & Sons Foundry is a prime example of America's industrial heritage. My question for the sponsor of the earmark would be: What factory in the United States would not be a prime example of America's industrial heritage? That's the problem that I think we have with a lot of these earmarks, particularly those that are to promote tourism or industry. How do you choose winners and losers in this game? How do we say, well, hey, this old factory is deserving of renovation, is deserving to draw tourists and is deserving of taxpayer dollars, while that one down the road is not? It seems to me a rather arbitrary decision based on one, perhaps, powerful Member of Congress who is able to slip in a provision to get an earmark. It doesn't seem to be very fair to other Members or to the taxpayers as a whole.

Furthermore, if any of our constituents who may want to take their families on a tour of America's industrial heritage, for any of them, for wanting to, they may have a hard time getting to see the W.A. Young & Sons Foundry. It's only open for the public 2 days a year, just 2 days a year. $150,000 to the taxpayer for 2 days a year open to the public. Other than that, you will have to get a private tour.

I simply don't understand why we are spending taxpayer money to promote tourism, why we choose one group over another, why we are picking winners and losers here. That's what I would ask the sponsor of the earmark if the sponsor of the earmark is here. I don't believe that he is, but I would be glad to hear some answers to these questions.

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

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. The W.A. Young & Sons Foundry and Machine Shop is truly an American treasure. This remarkably well-preserved shop is an example of the once-common, shaft-driven job shop which played an important role in maintaining and repairing the machines that built early industrial America.

This rare industrial facility contains machining and foundry equipment dating back to the mid-to-late 1800s. When the shop doors were shuttered more than four decades ago, everything, the tools, drills, nails, presses, lathes, wooden molds and patterns were left behind, creating a priceless time capsule from the turn of the century.

The machine shop and foundry are still able to operate, but the structure of the facility has severely deteriorated and is in desperate need of repair and restoration in order to preserve the

facility and the historic equipment within. And I would assume that's why it hasn't been open; they're waiting to do the repairs.

The W.A. Young & Sons Foundry and Machine Shop is documented by the National Park Service Historic American Engineering Record and listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

I would also point out to my colleagues that in approaching this task, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) and I, and our staffs collectively, reviewed all of these projects. There were 10 requests for every project that was put in the bill. And when we added it up, at the end of the day, it is four-tenths of 1 percent. Now, that is still significant, but I think it's important for us to realize that we are dramatically reducing the number of overall earmarks in this bill, a much greater reduction than when the other party was in charge. From 1994 to 2006, it went from approximately 1,000 earmarks up to 13,000 earmarks; 13,000 earmarks. We have cut this back dramatically. I think we've done a good job.

I was hoping that the gentleman would be here today to praise us, saying you have met the standard that the administration said. You cut the 50 percent that PELOSI said you were going to cut. I was hoping the gentleman would be here saying, ''Well done,'' and yet we have another amendment.

So, I'm in opposition to this. I think we should keep moving. We have other legislation to do. I know a lot of people in this body want to get home on Friday, so I hope we can move expeditiously.

I appreciate the gentleman's evenhandedness in making selections, though I didn't notice that he had a reduction of the President's request.

And again, I want to point out to the gentleman, you know, remember, the power of the purse is one of Congress' most important powers. And I think we should be very careful when we start undermining that important legislative tool that separates us from the executive branch.

So, this is Mr. MURTHA's project from Pennsylvania, a very senior member of the Appropriations Committee. I urge all of my Members to support Mr. MURTHA's project and to oppose the Flake amendment.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. TIAHRT. I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, is it possible for a gentleman who has an amendment before the Committee of the Whole under the current unanimous consent to reserve part of their time?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Yes, it is. Under the order of the House, time for debate is controlled.

Mr. TIAHRT. The gentleman from Arizona wasn't aware of that. So for the purposes of debate, I will move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Under the order of the House a manager may do that.

The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I'm glad to learn that. That will make it much better. It's much better to have more of a colloquy.

I would have liked to have had a colloquy with the sponsor of the earmark, but the sponsor of the earmark is not here. It makes it difficult to know exactly what this is for.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLAKE. Yes, I would.

Mr. DICKS. I can get you his phone number.

Mr. FLAKE. Maybe that's safer.

What I would like to ask, for example, I mention that this foundry is only open 2 days a year. It has been open for private tours for quite a while for a number of years. There is no indication with this earmark, certainly because we don't get the request letter, we only get the certification letter, that it will be open for any more than that.

And I don't know about you, but it's a tough sell. I can tell you, I have five kids. It would be tough to say, Do you want to go to Disneyland or W.A. Young & Sons Foundry?

I can see why anybody would want an earmark to renovate something or to promote tourism in a particular area, but virtually every district in the country would like that as well. How do we decide this one is worthy and this one is not? Just because we have a Member who is a powerful member of the Appropriations Committee or not. We shouldn't be doing it this way.

The gentleman made a good point, that the President has his own earmarks. The administration does earmark funds, but it's typically with accounts that we've given them. We say, here's an amount of money and for this program. For example, there is the Save America's Treasures account that the President, or the administration through a competitive grant process, decides this site is worthy of historic preservation or worthy of receiving funds. What we're doing with earmarking frequently is circumventing that process and saying, I don't think they're going to do it right, so I'm just going to earmark my own project and get that funding for my own project. That's no way to do business. If we don't like the way the administration is doing something, that's what the oversight process is about, and we should go back in and stipulate and mandate.

I have mentioned many times, particularly with Homeland Security grants, there are projects in my own district that I think are a waste of Federal taxpayer dollars or not an appropriate use of Federal taxpayer dollars, and I would like to go in. And I will, through this process, if I can, seek to strike some of the President's own requests. We should be doing that. But we shouldn't say because they do it and because they misuse Federal taxpayer dollars that we should as well. That's not what our power of the purse should be about.

So that's why we're here today, to say what is an appropriate use of Federal taxpayer dollars. Is it appropriate, in this case, and we can talk about what the Republicans did versus what the Democrats did. You won't find me defending what Republicans did in terms of ramping up earmarks. We went from some 1,400 to 14,000 over a decade, and it's a pox on our House. It's part of the reason I think we lost in November. I hope the minority, now majority learn a lesson from us.

I am glad to see the number of earmarks and the whole dollar value come down, but it should come down much lower. We not only need to change the level of spending, but the type of spending as well. And with earmarking, it was way out of control. It's still out of control with this legislation, in my view.

Mr. TIAHRT. 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. FLAKE).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

TITLE VI—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. None of the funds made available for this Act may be used for the Columbus Fire Fighters Union in Columbus, Ohio.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 26, 2007, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Chairman.

This amendment would prohibit funding from going to the Columbus Firefighters Union, which is an AFL–CIO-affiliated union.

The certification letter for this project is quite vague. Remember that

these are not request letters, so we don't know a lot about these earmarks. These are only certifications that are made, usually three or four sentences long. The certification letter says that the earmark money is for the Columbus Firefighters Hall. The letter also states that the entity to receive this funding is the Columbus Firefighters Union. The earmark list accompanying the bill calls the project ''Firefighters Hall.''

According to the certification, the funding would be used to renovate and expand the Toledo & Ohio Railway Depot. Suffice to say, this information wasn't much to go on to learn about the earmark, so I had my staff e-mail the Appropriations Committee for further details, which they did provide.

The committee informed us that the Toledo and Ohio Central Railway station at 379 West Broad Street in Columbus, Ohio is the largest remaining 19th century railroad palace in central Ohio. Today it serves as local headquarters for the Volunteers of America, a national organization with a variety of charitable and service programs.

The committee also stated that the depot has been adapted to serve the modern needs of the Volunteers of America, while also preserving much of the 100-year-old architecture. The decorative ''grand lobby'' may be rented for parties, receptions and meetings.

It's a little unclear whether this is to renovate an old building. It seems to me there are already tenants in the building. And one of the tenants in the building I believe will be, or the entity that is receiving the earmark to renovate is the AFL–CIO-affiliated Firefighters Union Local 67.

Again, this is a question of there are a lot of firefighters halls around the country, there are a lot of buildings that need to be renovated. We give the administration money under programs to allocate on a competitive basis to do historic preservation. This, seems to me, is circumventing that process again. And again, why is it proper to say that this one is worthy of funding and this one isn't?

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

□ 1100

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and in support of the provision in question.

Let me first say that I admire the gentleman from Arizona's dedication to ensure that waste, fraud and abuse is rooted out of the Federal Government.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, I believe that all earmarks in appropriations bills should be able to be publicly defended. That is why I welcome this opportunity to explain this project and assure this body that it is absolutely appropriate.

To begin with, let me talk about the Save America's Treasures account in which this earmark has been designated for funding. Save America's Treasures is a public-private partnership between the National Park Service and the National Trust For Historic Preservation. The program has preserved for future generations such important historical treasures as Montpelier, the home of President James Madison; Fort Ticonderoga; and the USS Constitution Museum.

So for anyone who has been to Independence Hall in Philadelphia, or the Old North Church in Boston, or Monticello, or anywhere of historical significance to this country, we should be able to understand the importance of experiencing history firsthand at the sites that history was indeed made. We can also imagine the tragic loss we would feel if these sites were not preserved.

Therefore, I can say that it is, without a doubt, that the Federal Government should take an interest in preserving sites, artifacts and monuments that carry special historic significance in American history. In order to be considered for funding under this account, Mr. Chairman, a building must be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. This is not a simple designation to acquire. It is very difficult. After extensive State scrutiny and nomination, there also is a stringent criteria applied by the National Parks Service.

Specifically, this project will preserve the Toledo and Ohio Central Railway Depot in my hometown of Columbus and specifically in the community of Franklinton. Constructed in 1896, the T&OC depot was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1973. It is a very unique, pagoda-style building, designed by noted architect Frank Packard. Its location is in the very historic Franklinton neighborhood of Columbus. That is also significant, as this was the site of the first settlement of all in Central Ohio. In recent years, this building became abandoned and risked being demolished. To protect this important structure, the City sought proposals to renovate and preserve it.

Mr. Chairman, the Columbus Firefighters came to the rescue. They proposed renovation of the historic structure in order to preserve it and to include a public exhibit honoring the history and contribution of firefighting in our country.

While the total cost of this entire project is $2.7 million, the small $100,000 Federal investment through this earmark will only be used to renovate the historic sections of this building to its original glory and preserve for future generations. I can think of no better use of such a significant historic building than by those who maintain the time-honored American tradition of service and sacrifice to one's neighbors and one's community.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, this amendment deserves to be opposed by all Members of the House who value the history of our country, the preservation of historic sites and the contribution of firefighters to our communities.

Save America's Treasures is a valuable program and it is a worthwhile project that should be preserved. The combination of preserving the tradition of our Nation's rail history and honoring our Nation's brave firefighters is worthy of this body's support.

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

Mr. FLAKE. If the gentlewoman will respond, I have a question. The earmark states that it is for Firefighter's Hall in Columbus, but the certification letter says the money is to go to the firefighters' union. Why does the union get the money?

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. The union provided the contract to do the renovation. The money proposed in this earmark is only for the historical renovation. The firefighters are the ones who took on the task of coming to the rescue of this very historic site and had the best bid.

Mr. FLAKE. Is there another firefighters' museum in Columbus?

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Not that I know of.

Mr. FLAKE. Let me just say, again, the gentlewoman mentioned that we have this program for historic preservation, the Saving America's Treasures, and that it is tough to get on the list for that. As I understand it, grants are given out and those grants are announced in late summer. If you receive one of those grants, then you are named an historic site or an official recipient. You can also make a contribution. If you are a local entity looking to have your own facility designated, you can make a contribution to Save America's Treasures and earmark that for the project that you want it to go to. There are other ways to receive recognition.

It just seems to me that it would be more appropriate for the local entities to bear responsibility for this and not the Federal Government.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield, this is a $2.7 million project. The Federal Government's contribution is $100,000. It is truly a public-private partnership in which the firefighters and the local government and the State government are participating fully.

Mr. FLAKE. That is understood. There are a lot of State and local governments everywhere, I would submit, that would like to have this kind of participation. But we simply can't do it. We simply cannot fund every project out there. So it seems to me that if we are going to have a project, or we are going to have an account that we set up with the Federal agency, we allow that to take its course.

If we don't like the way it is run, it is our obligation as Members of Congress to stipulate that it should be done differently. But we shouldn't go in and circumvent that process and say, all right, I am going to earmark these projects because I fear that they might not receive designation or they might not be chosen by this Federal agency. If we don't like how that is set up, let's change that process. But let's not move in, as Members of Congress, and designate specific funds.

I have a lot of respect for the gentlewoman from Ohio and count her as a friend. I am not questioning anything here but the wisdom of using Federal taxpayer money to do this type of thing.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I would be glad to yield to the ranking member.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman for this. I want to point out that we did a joint review process of each of these earmarks to make sure that they were within the guidelines of what we have done in past precedence in the House. This particular earmark, like the other earmarks, passed this process. This is part of the Save America's Treasures program, authorized by the Save America's Treasures Act. It is a 50/50 match on a small portion of a larger project. It is also on the National Registry of Historic Places.

I think the fundamental question that we have is, do we think it is proper for Federal dollars to be part of this effort? I think that is what Members should base their vote on, whether we think that this should be a part of the Federal effort to save a historic place like this.

The gentleman from Arizona brought up a very good point. He said that we can't fund every request. That is true. I think that some requests we have had were culled from this because they didn't meet the past precedent or the standards that we had left in place before. Just by sheer limits on the number of amendments and the dollar amounts available, we have also created limits for this process of selecting these treasures that are part of our history and to save them.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I reclaim my time.

Mr. Chairman, I would also point out to the gentleman that the precedent on this Save America's Treasures has been to split the money 50/50; 50 percent would go to the administration and they would then make decisions on a competitive basis. The other 50 percent would be earmarked by the Members of Congress.

I think that process works well. Congress has the right to do this under the power of the purse. This is one of our most important constitutional rights. There is nothing wrong with it. The Supreme Court has never questioned it. It is part of our constitutional history.

I just want to also join my friend from Kansas and say that I support this project. I urge that the Flake amendment be rejected and that we support this project. It has been carefully vetted. I think we could have straightened out the name of the title here and helped ourselves, but that is a lesson learned for next year.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. 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. FLAKE).

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

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

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

□ 1115

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to my good friend from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to thank the subcommittee, the chairman, and the ranking member for their support of the existing program to eradicate nutria. It is Public Law 108–16. It is called the Nutria Eradication and Control Act. I also want to thank the chairman and ranking member for the amount of money that they have put into the National Wildlife Refuge System.

This particular program, the Nutria Eradication and Control Act, has spent over the last 10 years over $1 million to eradicate this invasive species on a National Wildlife Refuge in the State of Maryland which involves 27,000 acres. It also has been helped by the USDA APHIS program.

This program to eradicate nutria on 27,000 acres in the State of Maryland and surrounding private lands has been one of the best invasive species eradication programs in the United States. There are 16 other States where nutria pose a problem. So the precedent where we have eradicated this nutria on 27,000 acres at the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge and surrounding areas shows that the project is a success.

The Interior appropriation bills we are considering today includes generous increases in the National Wildlife Refuge System, and I support all of this money. But, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have some type of dialogue and colloquy now that, as we move this process through the House and through the Senate, there is a recognition that this program has been successful, that it needs to continue in other areas around the Blackwater Refuge so that other States, 16 more, understand how this program, how it works in difficult terrain, in marshland, in swampland, can be successful in their areas.

So I would ask that the chairman, I know there are difficult choices, there are budget problems, but as we move this process through, that the nominal funding, this small amount of funding that we will need to continue this program in the State of Maryland, be considered.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comments and his interest in addressing the threat posed by invasive species to our natural resources. I will certainly work with the gentleman to help address this pressing need as we go through this process.

I know how important this invasive species issue is. Out in my area we have a major problem with Spartina, and we have had to fight it in the Willapa Bay area and Grays Harbor area. So I am very sympathetic to this. Also with the Fish and Wildlife Service, I guess there is an interagency group that is working on invasive species. So let's look at existing programs, and we will try our best to find a way to help the gentleman.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and look forward to working with him.

Mr. DICKS. I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

TITLE VI—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. None of the funds made available in this Act may be for the Philadelphia Art Museum Exterior Façade in Philadelphia, PA.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 26, 2007, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prevent any funding in the bill from going to the Philadelphia Art Museum for their exterior facade work. The Philadelphia Art Museum is receiving $100,000 in taxpayer funds in this bill.

The certification letter submitted to the Appropriations Committee in this project is a little vague again. It simply states that the money is to be used for a comprehensive exterior renovation and preservation project of the main building historic facade. I should note again the certification letters that we get as Members tell us a lot less than the actual request letters do. That certainly is the case here.

When my staff looked at the museum Web site, it is clear that the museum has plans for expansion by creating a ''skylit galleria, a spacious gallery extending along Pennsylvania Avenue in Philadelphia.''

The skylit galleria would be some 35 feet high, 200 feet long, and join the lobby and new cafe. The Web site says that with its terrazzo floor and tilted corbelled wall, this new space connects the old building to the new extension along the length of the preexisting north exterior facade.

I understand the main building is historic. But the question is, if the certification letter says it is for the historic facade and you are talking about flooring and other things, it seems to me that the money is going to the new extension.

Again, I would simply make the same point here that I have made before. There are a lot of worthy projects. Certainly renovation and historic preservation is a good thing and a lot of good people contribute their own money to it, as they should. But the question is, should Federal taxpayer dollars be used in this way, particularly given the financial situation we are in as a Federal Government.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the Philadelphia Art Museum is an historic location, well-known throughout the world, with over 1 million visitors a year, 78 years in existence.

The project for the modernization and renovation of the museum is one of note. It is important this year over $130 million will be spent. This $100,000 will be less than 1 percent of that. But it is an important effort for the Federal Government to participate and support the renovation of the exterior.

This multiyear program of over half a billion dollars to renovate and modernize the Philadelphia Art Museum is an important linchpin to an expansion along the parkway in Philadelphia's role in the world in terms of a world-class art collection. The Barnes Museum will be built and the Rodin Museum.

The collection will bring more visitors, twice as many visitors, to Philadelphia, as if we would have the Super Bowl in Philadelphia, and these visitors will spend three times as much money. Many of them are international travelers and art collectors and people who appreciate art.

I know that the House, notwithstanding the views of one Member who has offered this amendment, I am certain that a majority of the Members of this House will speak clearly that when we are talking about America's treasures, that the very well known but very old and in need of repair Philadelphia Art Museum deserves support under the program, the Saving America's Treasures program, which was designed exactly for this purpose and in which it has been the practice that the Congress would select about half of the projects.

So I ask that we oppose this amendment, and I ask that we support the Philadelphia Art Museum in this effort in this city and Philadelphia region. Many of our Members and families have visited, and we encourage all to visit, including the gentleman who is the sponsor of the amendment.

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

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentleman's project. We have looked at this carefully. As we understand it, it deals with the historic facade, and this is an important project. I think it is a very modest amount of money, which has to be matched by the locals. They are putting up a huge amount of additional money so there won't be any problem with that.

I congratulate the gentleman on his project and urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

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

Mr. FLAKE. If the gentleman would explain, I am still a little confused. The earmark states it is for Philadelphia Art Museum exterior facade, but then we are talking about an extension or expansion as well. Is this for the historic facade or for an expansion?

Mr. FATTAH. If the gentleman would yield, this grant would be to assist in the project related to repair of the historic facade of the existing museum.

Mr. FLAKE. So not to the new expansion.

Mr. FATTAH. I think you would say ''asked and answered'' at this moment, right?

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

TITLE VI—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for Payne Gallery, Moravian College in Pennsylvania.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 26, 2007, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit any of the funds in the bill from going to the Payne Art Gallery at Moravian College at Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. The certification letter submitted by the Member sponsoring the project stated the money would go to the restoration and preservation of the Payne Art Gallery at the college. The funding would be used for exterior restoration, rehabilitation, and conservation of Payne Gallery.

Payne Art Gallery is a small art gallery at a college. The college underwent a renovation in 2001 to achieve Smithsonian exhibit standards. It currently hosts about five to six exhibits a year. This small art gallery is to receive $150,000 in Federal funding from the U.S. taxpayer.

Again, I would simply ask, there are a lot of small colleges around the country, hundreds of them, thousands of them. Many have art galleries. Where do we say this is worthy and this is not? Why are we using U.S. Federal taxpayer dollars for this purpose when we are in the fix that we are in financially?

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. DENT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I also do want to thank my friend from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), and he is indeed a friend, but I also want to thank him for giving me this opportunity to fully vet and disclose this particular project on the campus of Moravian College in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, specifically on the Priscilla Payne Hurd campus, and we are speaking today about the Payne Gallery. I think it is very important that we have this kind of discourse in a very open and transparent manner.

But let's first understand and explain the purpose of the Saving America's Treasures program. The purpose is to preserve nationally significant, historic properties that are threatened or endangered. The projects must mitigate the threat, have a clear public benefit, and there has to be a non-Federal match. That is certainly the case here.

I should let everybody know too the historic significance of Moravian College. It is America's sixth oldest college, sixth oldest. It is located within the City of Bethlehem, which is really the site, and it is perhaps arguable, but we claim where I live in the Lehigh Valley of Pennsylvania, it is really the birthplace of the America Industrial Revolution, and the Moravians were a key driver in that industrialization process in the 18th century.

There is a very strong industrial and cultural heritage. The Moravians were

not only industrialists; they were people of faith. They came from Germany and other parts of Central Europe.

The Priscilla Payne Hurd campus is significant to the story of the City of Bethlehem and to the college. The Payne Gallery is nationally significant. It exhibits collections from the Smithsonian National Museum of American History and the Smithsonian Institute of Libraries.

This historic property is certainly threatened. This funding will mitigate the threat. There is a clear public benefit. This gallery will be used and enjoyed by countless visitors to Bethlehem, the Christmas City. We enjoy numerous visitors from around the world every year to be in Bethlehem during Christmas to participate in the Moravian tradition, culture and heritage of the community.

There is certainly a non-Federal match. It will be $205,000. The total project cost is $350,000. The amount of funding in the bill is $150,000 of Federal money.

Just coincidentally, there was an article today in one of the local newspapers back home: ''Moravian College gets $130,000 historic grant. The Getty Foundation cash focuses on preserving classic architecture.''

I am just going to restate and read briefly a few things said in the local paper today about this campus about which I am speaking. Moravian College again is the sixth oldest college in the country. It has 11 buildings in the National Register of Historic Places, all of the them in the Priscilla Payne Hurd campus downtown. They include the Brethren House, built in 1748, which the Getty Foundation called ''one of the best examples of colonial German architecture in the country.''

That is what a group of philanthropists in California said about this particular campus in the City of Bethlehem. This is historically significant, and this grant will support a comprehensive evaluation of the college's buildings and form the basis of an historic preservation plan.

One of the stated goals of the project is to ''develop strategies for using, preserving, and enhancing historic structures.''

The president of the college just said today that he is proud of the continuous use of its oldest structures: ''Our students study music and practice Bach in the very rooms in which so many remarkable young students did nearly two centuries ago. Moravian's historic structures are alive and vital, the past in the continuous present.''

That is what the president of the college said.

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

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in strong support of the gentleman's projects and congratulate him on the hard work that he has demonstrated and his very comprehensive knowledge of this project. I urge a ''no'' vote on the Flake amendment.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman.

I did want to say that, again, this campus, this gallery, and by the way, Priscilla Payne Hurd is alive and well, she is in her eighties, a wonderful matriarch of the community, philanthropist, has contributed so much to this community in preserving the culture and the heritage of America. This is not simply about my hometown. This is about American history and culture and, frankly, faith. Faith. The Moravians were people of great faith.

Again, every year people come to Bethlehem in great numbers to hear Bach. They come here to hear Bach. Moravian is such a integral part of that. You really can't separate the Moravians from the City of Bethlehem, again, the Christmas City. We are very proud of what they do there.

I believe this project fits precisely into the definition of the Saving America's Treasures program. You couldn't find a better fit.

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I will simply make the point, this sounds like a great gallery, a lot of history, certainly something that tourism and other things can pay for, that can carry its own load locally. Why do we need the Federal Government to be involved, that is my question.

Given the priorities and the situation we are in with the Federal Government, the last time I checked we were some $8 trillion in debt, why are we doing this? Where does it end? When do we say enough is enough?

We can't afford to fund projects like this around the country that have a local program that can support it. We simply can't go on doing this. That is the point that I would like to make.

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. FLAKE).

The amendment was rejected.

□ 1130

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to mention an amendment I was going to offer but did not for fear it would not garner the appropriate number of votes, and that was to dam up Yosemite Valley. It is about time that we dam up that valley, let it flood now because Los Angeles and southern California is in dire need of water. We are talking about global warming and we are talking about the need for water for our people.

Now that would be a ridiculous amendment; but yet we didn't even get a chance to have $7 million as requested by the administration to look at the possibility of restoring Yosemite Valley's twin, the Hetch Hetchy.

Eighty-four years ago the Hetch Hetchy Valley, the smaller twin to Yosemite Valley that is completely contained within the boundaries of Yosemite National Park, the only instance in which we dammed up a river to cover up a valley inside a national park took place.

What did John Muir say about it? He said: ''Dam Hetch Hetchy! As well dam for water-tanks the people's cathedrals and churches, for no holier temple has ever been consecrated by the heart of man.''

This is one of the beautiful natural resources in this country, and the administration said give us $7 million to study whether we could get rid of O'Shaughnessy Dam that has been there for 84 years, restore this valley and show that we can provide that water supply to the city of San Francisco so we can give our children and grandchildren this great natural resource.

Now I will admit I am biased. I met my wife in Yosemite on the banks of the Merced River in the beautiful Yosemite Valley. But let me just ask you, we talk about all these things, preserve this museum and preserve this art gallery and so forth. Can you imagine if we can give back to the American people another Yosemite Valley? And yet we cannot even get the committee $7 million to study the possibilities. Why are people afraid of this?

We talk about preserving nature and concern for our national parks. This is a desecration of one of the most beautiful natural parks in the history of this Nation, Yosemite Valley. Most people don't know that there is a twin valley just north of it called the Hetch Hetchy because it is underwater. The city of San Francisco pays $50,000 a year to cover up one of the great, beautiful natural wonders of this Nation. And yet we couldn't even get $7 million to study, not to do it, to study if it is feasible.

The governor has just completed a study in which he said it was feasible, and said we need the Federal Government, since it is Federal land, to look at it and it will cost about $7 million. And this committee said no, we can't. The Speaker doesn't want it. Senators who happen to be in and around San Francisco don't want it.

I don't know what is more environmentally important than saving one of the great wonders of the world that is underwater.

John Muir said this is the greatest desecration, the greatest desecration of natural resources in this Nation. John Muir, not usually noted as a Republican, but one of the great conservationists in the history of the United States. And we couldn't even get $7 million. I am very disappointed. I am extremely disappointed.

If anybody wants to look at this, go to Yosemite Valley, go to that national

park and say you want to look at the Hetch Hetchy which John Muir said is one of the great cathedrals of nature in this country. It is kind of tough to see it because it is underwater.

Now I'm not saying stop the water from going to San Francisco, I am saying there are alternatives that would restore this beautiful, fantastic, feature of nature; and yet in this bill, we can't even allow $7 million.

Mr. DICKS. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIAHRT. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. DICKS. I thank the ranking member for yielding, and I just would like to ask the gentleman from California, does he have an estimate of what the cost of doing this would be?

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. That is the whole purpose of having a study for $7 million to estimate the cost and to make sure that the city of San Francisco and the other water districts receive that money.

Mr. DICKS. It may have been in the governor's study or one of the other studies that have been done.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas' time has expired.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

As I understand it, some of the cost estimates that have come in, this would be up to $10 billion. I think one of the reasons why the committee took the action it did take was because of this great big $10 billion bill and not having any kind of a plan for how that would be financed.

But I am sensitive to what the gentleman has said in terms of the importance of this. We will take this very seriously, and we will look and see what the Senate does and we will continue to work with our friend from California who is a valued Member of the House.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. As you may recall, this first came up during the Reagan administration when then-Secretary Don Hodel was surprised when a staff member came into his office and said, Mr. Secretary, how would you like to give us another Yosemite Valley?

He said, What are you talking about?

The staff member said there is a twin to Yosemite Valley sitting under, I forget how many feet of water. He said, Well, that water goes to San Francisco, doesn't it?

And he said, Yes, but we think there are alternatives that would allow San Francisco to still get that water, that pristine water, as it has for 80-some years, and yet restore the Hetch Hetchy. The estimates I have seen, it may cost upwards of $2 billion. Now that is a lot of money, but I would ask you: How much would it cost us to build a Yosemite Valley if we could possibly build it? It is priceless, as they say in the commercial.

Mr. DICKS. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's obvious sincerity and passion, and we will continue to look at this.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the chairman of the committee.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from Indiana for a statement.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I had planned to introduce an amendment and I chose not to do that, and I will explain why.

But my amendment would have sought to reduce by $2.6 million the salaries and expense account of the Smithsonian Institute, an account in which there is a history of well-documented, wasteful spending of taxpayer dollars.

Though I called for a freeze in the funding for the Smithsonian's administrative account, this amendment should not be mistaken for opposition to this important institution. For more than 150 years, the Smithsonian has made significant contributions to the cultural enrichment of the United States. Through its 18 museums, 144 affiliate museums, the National Zoo, and nine research centers around the world, the Smithsonian has contributed to the education of millions of people.

In fact, officials estimate that 24 million people visited the Smithsonian in 2006 and almost 21 million visited affiliate museums across the world. There is no doubt that the Smithsonian reaches across America and the world to offer a rich experience for both children and adults alike.

I think I speak for most of my colleagues in expressing a deep appreciation for the excellent work the Smithsonian does, but I also agree with the Appropriations Committee that the institution has recently exhibited a ''crisis of leadership, governance and principle.''

As was well-documented in the press and here in Congress, some of the Smithsonian's top officials received exorbitant salaries and housing allowances, traveled lavishly, and made otherwise egregious expenditures on the taxpayers' dime.

My constituents, like many of yours, sent me to Washington to ensure that their tax dollars were spent wisely. They believe, as I do, that Congress should not reward waste, fraud or abuse with more taxpayer dollars. This amendment would have called for the Smithsonian to enact steps to get its spending practices under control. It was meant to send the message that until the Smithsonian can demonstrate it can responsibly spend taxpayer dollars, it should not receive increased funding.

I would like to thank Chairman DICKS for allowing me to talk about this amendment that I believe would have taken a real step in addressing waste, fraud and abuse in the Smithsonian. However, after discussion with several of my colleagues who serve on the Smithsonian Board of Regents, I have been assured that this institute has begun to enact measures that will lead to real reform in the institute. We should all continue to observe this, as well as all institutions under our control.

Mr. DICKS. I would like to say to the gentleman that I believe the committee has, in essence, enacted the spirit of your amendment. We have reduced the Smithsonian's budget by $35 million. The salaries and expenses level has come down to where it was in 2007. And we didn't do this as a punitive measure, we did this to send a very strong message, as the gentleman has in his very eloquent floor statement, and that message is we want the Smithsonian Board of Regents to reform the Smithsonian.

We all respect and admire and love the institution ourselves. We want to, and I personally hope we can in conference restore funding after they have made the appropriate changes that the committee has talked to them about. I think that is happening as we speak.

I have had a chance to talk to a number of the regents and Members of the House who serve as regents, and I am confident that they are on the right track. We hope by the time we get to conference, we will all be satisfied that they have reached the goal of reforming and changing so that the House and the other body can feel confident in funding them at the appropriate level.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That is why I did not offer the amendment because I am confident that we will watch this.

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. TIAHRT. First, I would like to thank the gentleman from Indiana for bringing up this important issue. There were problems that were occurring at the Smithsonian, and it was evident in the press and it was evident in the dialogue we had here on the Hill and in committee. I want to commend the chairman for his leadership in trying to focus our resources on the problem.

When the studies are complete, I think we will all be satisfied that we can move forward. The Smithsonian is a great institution and it needs powerful leadership, and we need to have strong checks and balances in place. I believe those are being put in place.

So thank you for bringing the issue to the floor of the House. And I thank the chairman for helping us get a strong institution in the Smithsonian that will last for years.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

TITLE VI—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the Southwestern Pennsylvania Heritage Preservation Commission in Hollidaysburg, Pennsylvania; the Westsylvania Heritage Corporation in Hollidaysburg, Pennsylvania; and the Progress Fund in Greensburg, Pennsylvania.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 26, 2007, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prevent funding from going to the Southwestern Pennsylvania Heritage Preservation Commission in Hollidaysburg, Pennsylvania. This is one of the most expensive earmarks in the bill. The commission is to receive an earmark of $1.2 million. The Web site for this commission states that the southwestern region of Pennsylvania was hard hit when a lot of manufacturing jobs left the region. The Web site also states that it was a ''tough transition for hundreds of steelworkers, coal miners, railroaders and other workers who now find themselves without a job.'' I certainly, and any Member in this body, can sympathize with in their own district.

But the Web site goes on to say that ''An idea emerged that the very industries that were struggling in the 1980's had transformed America once before. Could the proud history of southwestern Pennsylvania once again lead America through the next economic transition? With that, the Southwestern Pennsylvania Heritage Preservation Commission was born.''

A bill creating the Southwestern Pennsylvania Industrial Heritage Route, or Path to Progress National Heritage Area, was approved in Congress in 1988. The heritage area is managed by the Southwestern Pennsylvania Heritage Preservation Commission. If this is confusing to listeners, it is to all of us.

The Commission's Web site states that the law created the new heritage area to ''make it possible for millions of Federal dollars to flow into southwestern Pennsylvania.'' No doubt.

All of these funds are to be managed by the Commission.

The Commission's Web site states the Commission has ''created organizations, corporations, alliances, confederations, authorities, commissions, councils, and new businesses.'' No doubt.

The site goes on to explain that the committee ''spent money, borrowed money, loaned money, earned money, granted money, and accepted money.'' Nobody doubts that either.

The Web site explains that the Commission legislative mandate was renewed by Congress and it was to begin transferring its responsibilities to a public foundation.

I quote, ''several entities were created by the commission to achieve this—the Allegheny Heritage Development Corporation which then evolved in the Westsylvania Heritage Corporation and the Progress Fund, which would serve as a Community Development Financial Institution, providing gap and equity financing to an increasing number of tourism-oriented businesses.''

I should note that I have added language in this amendment to prevent Federal funding from going to the other two nonprofit entities that were created by the Southwestern Pennsylvania Heritage Commission.

My point in offering this amendment is to highlight the concept of earmark incubators, or entities created by Members of Congress through the legislative process that exist for the sole purpose of receiving more earmarks.

In this case, the Southwestern Pennsylvania Heritage Preservation Commission seems to be just that, an earmark incubator. It has spawned at least two other nonprofit entities, each with the sole purpose of fostering economic growth and tourism development in southwestern Pennsylvania with Federal taxpayer dollars.

□ 1145

It is no surprise that the CEO of the Westsylvania Heritage Corporation is also the executive director of the Southwestern Pennsylvania Heritage Preservation Commission. He is also a former Interior Department employee of 32 years.

Keeping track of all these entities that have been created based on this one national heritage area almost boggles the mind. The point of this amendment is to prevent funding from going to one entity, you have to go after all three.

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

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

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

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the chairman.

One of the benefits of reviewing these publicly is to help get some facts on the table with regard to what these projects are. This project of the Southwestern Pennsylvania Heritage Preservation program is one of 37 heritage sites around the Nation. It includes such other projects as the Tennessee Civil War Heritage Area, the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields Area, Mississippi Gulf Coast Area, the National Aviation Area and, of course, the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area in Arizona.

This one in Pennsylvania involves nine counties in four congressional districts. It was something that started in 1988 at that time, signed into law by President Reagan. The purpose of this was to help promote some of the heritage of the industries of iron, steel, coal and transportation that were an important part of Pennsylvania's history and our Nation's history. Thus, designation as one of these national historic areas.

It has had an impact that goes far beyond the money that has been invested in it, and, that is, a construction boom has come out of this. Also, it has spawned other projects such as dealing with acid mine drainage remediation projects, river conservation projects, county heritage plans, the creation of growth of trail development groups. More than 65 local preservation, conservation, and community organizations have significantly expanded their missions in recognition of their role in developing a heritage resource for the region. All in all it has helped leverage some $90 million of grants from other sources to help promote these programs with this.

We recognize that as we look at these projects around the Nation, those of us who are in Pennsylvania may understand best those projects in Pennsylvania as those in some of these other areas. Mississippi, I may not know as much about those or the ones in Virginia or Arizona or Georgia, wherever these other projects are. But this is important to Pennsylvanians and it's important to our Nation, to a large extent because Pennsylvania and the region was the area that built the world literally with steel, with our coal. We are a State that has lost manufacturing jobs. In fact, tourism and agriculture are our two highest sources of income in Pennsylvania, and it is important that we understand that tourism is a source of jobs in Pennsylvania like many other States. It draws visitors in not only from our Nation but from around the world and it is worthy of working on ways to continue these jobs with some growth.

The vast majority of funding for these programs has come from other sources. But what it has done, also, is help preserve some of that heritage. Understanding the history of our Nation is important to understanding the future of our Nation. Thus, we need to learn the lessons from history to fund these things to understand how it is important and how to promote this.

This is not just something for my district, but it is important to several districts; and it is important to our Nation and the start-up tourism-related businesses that are otherwise unable to secure loans from other programs.

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

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I want to commend the gentleman for his very thorough and comprehensive statement, and I want to join him in support of this project.

As the gentleman said, this project was authorized, signed by President Reagan, a very conservative President. This is historic activity that has been very productive. And so I urge that the project be supported and that the amendment by the gentleman from Arizona be defeated.

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Reclaiming my time, I would like to add a couple of other things that relate to some Federal overlap with this particular project. This whole area of the heritage preservation group for southwestern Pennsylvania also overlaps with 218 nationally registered properties, 16 national historic landmarks, two national park units and one other national landmark all recognized by the Federal Government as a way of linking these things together. It is a way of helping to promote these things for jobs and for understanding the heritage of our Nation.

Someone once said that those who fail to learn the lessons of history are doomed to repeat them. Indeed, where we stand now with an importance of understanding what our economic heritage was, our industrial and manufacturing heritage, are important to the people of southwestern Pennsylvania and are important to the people of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this so that we can preserve that heritage.

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

Mr. FLAKE. How much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the chairman.

If the gentleman will indulge me, I am still confused, maybe even further now. Looking at the list, it says here, Southwestern Pennsylvania Heritage Preservation Commission, $1.2 million, and the sponsor is Mr. MURTHA of Pennsylvania. Who is the sponsor?

Mr. DICKS. Mr. MURTHA of Pennsylvania. But as was mentioned by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, there are four congressional districts involved in this. I don't know if people from the other districts, I guess they didn't request it or else it would be listed because we've tried to list it where there were multiple names involved.

Mr. MURTHA is a former member of this subcommittee and this project has been funded for many years. When your party was in the majority, there were a number of years in which this project was funded. The previous chairman, Mr. TAYLOR, and others have been supportive of this project.

Mr. FLAKE. Thank you.

Reclaiming my time, I don't doubt that it was funded in the previous Congress. The question is with economic development. It is said that this helps promote tourism. It helps development. No doubt. You cannot spend money without creating economic activity by its very nature. But if we take economic development as the criteria, what project anywhere in the country is not worthy of that? And why is this project and all of these entities created, and I quote again from their own Web site. The commission Web site says: ''This organization created organizations, corporations, alliances, confederations, authorities, commissions, councils, new businesses,'' many of which are also eligible for earmark funding.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. DICKS. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. DICKS. I'll be very brief.

The point I would make is that we only funded one out of 10 requests. So there was a lot of judgment made by both sides of the aisle working together to pick those projects that had a history, that were authorized in many cases. So I think there was a very careful vetting of this process. There are a lot of Members who are mad at me because they didn't get their project. This one met the test and was funded.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

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. FLAKE).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STUPAK

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STUPAK:

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

TITLE VI—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. None of the funds made available in this Act for the Division of Criminal Investigation of the Environmental Protection Agency may be used in contravention of the criminal investigator requirements of the Pollution Prevention Act of 1990 (P.L. 101–593).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 26, 2007, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. STUPAK. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would require the Environmental Protection Agency to hire the appropriate number and amount of criminal investigators as required by law. EPA's criminal investigators play a critical role in protecting public health and the environment from the most serious offenders. That is why the Pollution Prosecution Act of 1990 (P.L. 101–593) specifically requires that not less than 200 special agents be assigned to environmental criminal enforcement. This requirement helps ensure that EPA has the number of investigators and adequate resources necessary to enforce the criminal provisions of our environmental law.

EPA's criminal investigation division, CID, is currently at less than 200 special agents. Already understaffed, seven agents from CID are permanently assigned to the EPA's administrator's personal security and do not conduct any investigation work. Additional agents are assigned to provide security when the administrator travels outside Washington, DC, requiring them to abandon any investigation work during that period.

The assignment of the EPA's criminal investigators to provide personal security to the EPA administrator diverts resources from the investigation of environmental crimes. While I understand the desire to protect a member of the President's Cabinet, criminal investigators at EPA are doing so at the cost of protecting public health. Because of the additional strain that using CID criminal investigator agents for security has on EPA's ability to investigate criminal violations, it is extremely important that CID be properly staffed.

The underlying bill, the bill before us today, provides an increase of $11.8 million for enforcement compared to fiscal year '07. The EPA should have no difficulty in meeting the requirement of 200 criminal investigative agents, which is the standard that was set in 1990. My amendment would not reduce the security provided by the EPA administrator. It would only make certain that the EPA uses this funding provided in the bill to meet their requirements under the Pollution Prosecution Act and their responsibility to the American people.

I want to thank Chairman DICKS for consideration of this amendment along with Ranking Member TIAHRT. I urge Members to vote ''yes'' on my amendment.

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

Mr. STUPAK. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I thank the gentleman for his amendment. The gentleman has discussed this amendment with all of us. The bill includes an increase of $11.8 million, as you have mentioned, above the President's request for EPA enforcement. That is enough money to bring the EPA's enforcement level back to levels that we saw earlier in this decade. The majority has no objection and accepts the amendment.

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

Mr. STUPAK. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. TIAHRT. I think the gentleman from Michigan has done his research and prepared this well. I think this is a part of the EPA that needs attention

and needs a little reinforcement. I congratulate him on his amendment and I have no objection to it.

Mr. STUPAK. I thank Mr. TIAHRT and Mr. DICKS for their words.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. JORDAN OF OHIO

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 22 offered by Mr. JORDAN of Ohio:

Page 111, after line 17, insert the following:

TITLE VI—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. 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 4.3 percent.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 26, 2007, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I thank the Chair and the Members who are present here.

This is the fourth time I've offered this amendment to an appropriations bill. I don't do it to be a pain in the neck. In fact, I appreciate the work of the chairman, I appreciate the work of the ranking member, and I appreciate the work of the committee and staff. I know they look at these line items, look at these programs, go through and do the hard work that all committees do. I appreciate all that work. I simply bring the amendment forward because I believe government is too big and that government spends too much.

This amendment doesn't cut spending. This amendment, like the previous ones I have offered, simply says we're going to hold the line. We're going to spend the same amount we spent in the last fiscal year. Nothing more than that. That's all the amendment does. It allows the committee who understands these programs, who does the work and puts this bill together, to go back and look and figure out where those cuts should happen using their expertise that they've developed in this committee to do that. It simply says, it's not too much to ask government to do what millions of families have to do across this country, live on last year's spending levels, live on last year's budget.

It is important we do this, in my judgment, for two reasons. Again I have articulated these each time I've brought this amendment forward for the body to consider. The first is there are financial problems, financial concerns, some would even say crisis looming for America if we don't get a handle on the spending. $3 trillion budget. This bill increases spending by over a billion dollars in this one area. The more we run up deficits, the more that leads to debt, the more that leads to less saving, the more that leads to less economic growth, the tougher it makes it in the future to deal with the economic crisis that is in fact coming.

Again, you don't have to take my word for it. All kinds of experts have talked about this, whether it's entitlement programs, discretionary spending, it's government spending and there are problems looming if we don't begin to get a handle on the spending levels that we appropriate. There is no better place to start than right now, saying, let's just do what we did last year. Let's just hold the line on spending.

The second reason that this is so important: whenever you start to spend and spend and spend and have these kinds of things take place, it inevitably leads to greater taxes. I've often heard the phrase tax-and-spend politicians. It's actually more appropriate to say spend and tax. Spending drives the equation. The more you spend, that leads to taxes in the future. If you went out and asked the American people, Mr. Chairman, is government too big or too small, my guess is the vast majority of Americans would say it's too big.

Think about this: government spends on average $23,000 per household. We've got a $3 trillion annual budget that we spend on. Many of those things are appropriate, but overall if you ask the American people is government too big or too small, they would say it's too big. If you asked them the same question, are Americans overtaxed or undertaxed, my guess is the vast majority of Americans would say we're overtaxed. In fact, a typical family, 50 cents of every dollar they spend goes to some level of government in the form of taxes. It's not too much to ask government to hold the line on spending, to live on what we did last year, to live on the same amount.

□ 1200

That's what this amendment does. I bring it forward, not to be a pain to the committee, I appreciate their work, but simply to point out it's time we get a handle on spending if we are going to be able to let or help America have the economic growth that we need to see happen in this country in the future.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington State is recognized for up to 20 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I might consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Am going to be brief here. This would be a devastating cut on this bill. I want to say something to the gentleman. These bills do have consequences.

Over the last 7 years, since this administration took power, the Interior Department's budget has been cut in real terms by 16 percent. The EPA's budget has been cut in real terms by 29 percent, and the Forest Service budget has been cut in real terms, taking fire out, by 35 percent. This is one of the few bills that has been devastated by this administration, and it's a regrettable fact.

All our bill does is stop this downward trend in our national parks, our downward trend in our national wildlife refuges, and our downward trend in enforcement and clean water and clean air in the environmental protection area, and the reduction in personnel, not covering fixed costs until Mr. Kempthorne came in, and he is only covering the fixed costs for the Interior Department. This is a devastating cut that would reverse all the good work in this bill.

I just think it's totally irresponsible, and I urge a ''no'' vote on this. We need the money for the firefighters, there is a huge fire out there in Lake Tahoe right now. We need to get this bill passed.

This kind of across-the-board meat-ax approach will not be successful, I predict. I just tell the gentleman that his amendment goes way too far and would have devastating consequences. It would undermine the President's Centennial Challenge that Mr. Kempthorne has worked so hard to create.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time and urge a ''no'' vote on the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, before recognizing the gentlelady from Tennessee, I would just point out this, we always hear this, devastating cut. This not a cut. This is simply saying we are going to spend what we spent last year.

In fact, last week we had this big debate on the legislative branch bill and on other appropriations bills, and the majority party was pointing to the President's request. What we spent last year is actually more than what the President requested in this budget.

Devastating cut, I mean, we always hear, it's interesting, politicians who spend the tax dollars of families and individual taxpayers across this country, always say the sky is going to fall if we can't get more of your money and spend it on things we think are important.

All we're saying is you know what, it's not too much to ask that government do what families do all the time, and that is spend on last year's level.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank Mr. JORDAN for the good work that he is doing right here. He is exactly right in the amendment that he is bringing forward, hold constant, hold it level.

Mr. Chairman, we hear this from our constituents every single day. We all know that the American people are certainly frustrated with the way they see Washington spend money, and the amount of money that they spend.

What our amendments are doing is just to say, just pare it down a little bit. Let's require the bureaucracy to institute some efficiencies. Let's require them to get their House in order.

Now, quite frankly, I don't think it's a bad thing. I think that it is a very positive step to look forward and say let's hold the bureaucracy accountable. Should they be able to move forward and not put best practices in place? Should they be able to just every year get an increase when we have men and women who go to work every single day? They may work for a period of 2 or 3 or 4 years and not see an increase in their salary.

We may have families that look at their budget and say that they are not seeing an increase. To say, you know, to not increase spending puts us on a downward trend.

I truly take exception with that. It is our constituents who are saying you need to start putting some accountability measures in place, you need to reduce what this Federal Government is going to spend because they tax too much and certainly, in order to pay for all of this increase in spending, and this is an increase, it exceeds the President's request by $1.9 billion, which is a 7.6 percent increase. In order to pay for this, they are willing to push forward the single largest tax increase in history because they spend too much money.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire, the majority party has yielded all their time back?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Yes, the other side has yielded back.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I haven't been on the floor to hear much of the debate on this bill, but a couple of things have caught my attention. One is that the chairman said we don't want across-the-board cuts.

Well, as I understand, they don't want cuts to individual programs or specific programs either, so I guess that means we don't want cuts, period. I remember hearing the debate on this floor about raising the minimum wage, and that has resonated in my memory in relationship to the debate on not making any cuts for this bill also.

There were raving comments made about how people who were living on the minimum wage hadn't received an increase for years and years and years, and yet Members of Congress had received pay raises.

Well, it seems to me that if we're concerned about people who are getting minimum wage, we definitely should be concerned about increasing spending for this bill or any other government program, for that matter. We are raising spending by billions of dollars, and where is that money coming from? That money is coming from the very people that were supposed to be helping those people making the minimum wage.

In just 6 months, the new Democrat majority has passed or paved the way for $103.4 billion in increased spending.

Now, what that means is, again, that we are taking that money away from the American citizens. By doing that, they have raised the national debt limit by $850 billion, which they said they would never do, or $2,812 for every single man, woman and child alive in the United States today, the second largest increase in the national debt in American history, and the largest single tax increase in American history they have passed.

So we don't need to be doing this. We need to be helping average working Americans, by letting them keep more of the money. The government doesn't know how to spend your money better than you know how to spend it.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the time remaining on the Republican side?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I yield as much time he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the Republican Study Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to thank him for his leadership. He is one of the outstanding freshmen Members that we have on this side of the aisle. His leadership in helping protect the family budget from the Federal budget is noted. It is noted in this body, and certainly noted in his district and increasingly being noted nationwide. So I thank him for his leadership in bringing this amendment to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very, very important amendment, and I listened carefully to chairman of the committee and his words. I think again, as I said yesterday on this House floor, that much good work has been done on this legislation.

But I do take exception when he uses the term that this amendment amounts to a devastating cut. Again, people are entitled to their own opinions, but they are not entitled to their own facts. This amendment simply says this appropriations bill will be funded at last year's level.

Now, last I looked at Webster's, and looked up the definition of cut, it means to reduce an amount. We are simply asking, in extraordinary times, that government somehow not increase its budget. We are not talking about a decrease here. We are simply saying try to live on the same budget that you lived on last year.

Now, I do believe there is a place where the phrase ''devastating cut'' is applicable.

As the gentleman from Ohio aptly pointed out, more spending fueled more taxes. Again, that is a very simple nexus, but more spending will fuel more taxes. It's one of the reasons that we have seen within the Democrat budget the single largest tax increase in American history.

Now, that tax increase, when fully implemented over 5 years, is going to amount to roughly $3,000 for every American family. That is a devastating cut. That is a devastating cut to the family budget.

I hear from these families. I hear from families in my district, the Fifth District of Texas, that I have the honor and pleasure of representing. I hear from people like Bruce in Garland who writes, ''Congressman, in my particular case, additional taxes would cut into the finances I used to pay for my son's college education. I really believe that given more money, Congress will simply spend more money. That is not the answer.''

I hear from Joy in Dallas, ''Congressman, I could not pay for a semester of college for my daughter if I had to send $2,200 more to the government.''

I hear from Linda, also, in the City of Garland that I represent, ''If we had to pay an additional $2,200 each year, it would make us have to decide between food or medicine.''

The list goes on and on and on. That is a devastating cut, the largest tax increase in American history fueled by more spending, some of which is contained in this bill, those are devastating cuts. Those are devastating cuts to hard-working American families. It's cutting their education program, it's cutting their health care program, it's cutting their American dream.

I certainly commend the chairman. Relative to some of these bills, this is a more reasonable approach.

But when we look at the largest tax increase in history, when we look at the looming entitlement crisis, and I was very grateful to hear the chairman acknowledge its existence in debate yesterday, but given all of those facts, can't we somehow raise the bar on how much we are going to spend on this Federal legislation and protect the family budget from the onslaught of the Federal budget?

There are two paths we can go down. One path leads us to an extra $3,000 of tax increases on the American family.

The other path tells the Federal budget, live with as much as you have lived with last year, and we will protect the American family from devastating cuts in their budget.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the Republican leader, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague from Ohio for yielding, and let me thank him for bringing this amendment to the floor.

All this amendment says is that we are going to reduce the level of spending in this bill to last year's level. It's overdoing. We are not whacking away

at everything, and I think that the gentleman has a very good point. I do that because excessive spending makes it more difficult for us to balance the Federal budget.

□ 1215

It takes money away from our children and our grandchildren. An across-the-board cut is another way of being fair and simple, but it gets us back to last year's level.

Now, the spending in these appropriations bills is one issue. But let's make sure we review the bidding on what's happened here thus far this year. In February, when the supplemental spending bill came through, the CR to fund the government for this year came through here, it had $6 billion of spending over and above the President's level.

And then we had the budget come through with an additional $20 billion worth of domestic discretionary spending included in it.

And then just last month we had the supplemental spending bill for Iraq and Katrina that had an additional $17 billion over and above what the President has asked for.

If you look at all of that, $1.1 billion in the Energy and Water Appropriations Bill that's already passed, another $1.9 billion in this bill, you begin to add all this up, and it's real money. And at some point, somebody has to pay for it. And that's the real crux of the issue here.

Most of us came here to make sure that we had a government that was affordable, so that we could keep the American Dream alive for our kids and theirs. And the more that we spend and the more that we mortgage their future, the harder it is for them to have the same chances in life that many of us have had.

And if the spending that we've talked about isn't bad enough, if you look at the budget that my friends across the aisle passed last spring, there's no entitlement reform. My colleague, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. OBEY, will soon rise and talk about the $4 billion or $4 trillion worth of debt that's accumulated over the last 6 years.

We know that we have to deal with entitlements. I'm trying to help you give your speech, Mr. OBEY. We have to deal with entitlements. Over the course of the 12 years that Republicans ran the House, we dealt with entitlements some three times, not as often as we should have, not as aggressively as we should have.

But we have made promises to ourselves, those of us who are baby boomers, promises that our kids and our grandkids can't afford. And at some point we, as responsible stewards of our government, need to grab a hold of these entitlements and begin to change them.

Several years ago we made a modest effort, some $40 billion in entitlement reductions over 5 years, a step in the right direction. But to bring a budget out here that says we're not going to deal with entitlements for the next 5 years, I think, is totally irresponsible. And so if we're serious about making sure that our kids and their kids have a real chance at the American Dream, we've got to say no.

The American people sent us here to make decisions about how to best spend their money. And if we just keep adding more money, guess what? We never have to make a decision. That's not what the American people expect of us. They expect of us to have a government that's affordable, that's accountable, and something that they can afford in their family budget.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, Members of this House have often heard me refer to my old friend, Archie the Cockroach, who is the philosopher I rely upon. And one of the things Archie said once is that ''an old stomach reforms more whiskey drinkers than does a new resolve.'' And I think we have a perfect example of that in this case.

We have seen the minority party, for the past 6 years, zealously and delightedly borrow over $1.2 trillion to pay for tax cuts on the cuff. We've seen them support this year providing $57 billion in tax cuts for people who make a million bucks or more a year. We've seen them blindly and blithely support a misguided war, 600 billion bucks, all borrowed. And now, coming in from a 3-day or 6-year jag, all of a sudden people are sobering up. So they're saying, ''Good gravy, look at the record we've built.''

Mr. Chairman, they have destroyed their credibility with their own conservative base with their profligate borrowing to pay for their pet projects. And then they say, ''Well, how can we cover up that and cover our tracks and pretend that we are taking up the old time religion again of fiscal responsibility?

And so what they do is they say, ''Well why don't we attack the appropriations bills and try to create the impression that they are runaway spending.''

Well, let me give you some facts. By the time this House finishes passing each of the appropriation bills that we're bringing to the floor, this House will have cut over 250 programs, saving almost $6 billion.

I would also point out that if you take a look at the President's budget, if you take a look at the domestic appropriation bills which he's recommended under his budget, you would see these domestic appropriations shrink from 39 percent of the budget to 36 percent. Under the bills that we're bringing to the floor, they will still shrink from 39 percent to 38 percent.

Bob Greenstein, who is probably the most objective budget analyst in this town, respected former OMB official, points out that these domestic appropriations bills, when adjusted for inflation, represent a 1.4 percent increase. I invite you to compare that to the 8, 9, 10 percent increases that we have in the war budgets which the President has asked us to pass.

This bill commits the cardinal sin of trying to restore two-thirds of the cuts that have taken place since fiscal year 2001 in crucial programs that defend the cleanliness of our air, that defend the cleanliness of our water, that protect the public health and protect the publicly owned natural resources of this country.

And they try to divert attention from their miserable record of fiscal irresponsibility the last 6 years by suggesting that somehow these actions have anything to do with the deficits that they've presented the country, turning a surplus when Bill Clinton left office into the largest deficits in the history of man.

Now, you know, I generally prefer to read nonfiction. But I am so used to hearing fiction on this House floor that I guess the next time I want to read a fiction novel I'm not going to go to The Washington Post Book Review or the New York Book Review. I'm simply going to ask my friends on the other side of the aisle, ''What's the best piece of fiction that you've been reading and been peddling this week, because I sure would like to take some lessons from you when it comes to peddling fiction.''

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, can I inquire the amount of time we have left.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 4½ minutes.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Before yielding to the gentleman from Georgia, I would just point out, I love the majority party's logic: because the Republicans spent too much, we're going to spend more. How does that help the American family? It just makes no sense to me.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I just heard some great news down here. We have cut 250 programs. I'm excited because, you know, I used to be in the construction business, and one time we had a superintendent that was not getting his job done, not performing, not getting the houses built on time. And the gentleman we worked for went in one day and he said, Jerry, I want you to go out there and I want you to fire somebody. And Jerry said, Who do you want me to fire? And he said, I don't care. Just fire somebody so they will know who's in charge.

We need to fire somebody. We need to cut something somewhere. And I am excited to hear that we have cut 250 programs at a savings to the taxpayers of $6 billion because, what that means to the taxpayers, Mr. Chairman, is that now we've only spent $80 billion more than we did in 2007. So we took the

first step in a long, long journey to get down to where we get back to the level of 2007.

I hope that the chairman, Mr. Chairman, of appropriations, the full Appropriations Committee, will supply every Member in this body a list of the 250 programs that have been cut, because I want to see that. I want to be able to take that back home to my constituents and say, You know what? We are cutting the size of government. And here are the 250 programs that we've cut.

Now, what I would also like for him to bring me when he brings me the 250 programs that we have cut, I hope that he will bring me a list of the other programs in the other expansion of government that we have done to spend another $80 billion.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a lot of people may not understand how much a billion dollars is. If you spent a dollar a day, no, if you spent a dollar a second, a dollar a second, it would take you 31½ years to spend a billion dollars; 31½ years to spend a billion dollars if you spent a dollar a second.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the people of America know that we have spent $80 billion more than we did last year. That scares me. That scares me not only for me. It scares me for my children. It scares me for my grandchildren. And it scares me for my great grandchildren.

And so I hope that somewhere we'll fire somebody, just one person, one cut that we can make and let the people of America see it.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of our time to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his leadership on this issue and for bringing important distinctions to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a question, though, of the body, and it's curious what's going on here. The chairman of the subcommittee yielded back his time, didn't even want to engage.

Can you hear it, Mr. Chairman? That's silence. That's silence on the part of the majority party because they aren't even interested in defending the spending that is in their bill.

Before I came to Congress, I was a physician. I knew that I needed to listen to patients in order to make the right diagnosis.

Well, the right diagnosis, Mr. Chairman, here, is that Washington doesn't have a revenue problem; it's got a spending problem. And the ways that the Democrats are moving forward with their spending spree of 2007 are very frightening, as the gentleman before me spoke.

There are a couple of ways to pay for it. One, you can charge it. And so they've increased the debt ceiling. They've increased the debt ceiling to over $9 trillion for the first time ever in the history of this Nation.

The other way you can pay for it is to tax folks. Mandatory withholding, tax increases. And already we've seen the largest tax increase in the history of our Nation adopted by this majority party.

Mr. Chairman, if that were my record, I wouldn't want to talk about it either. I wouldn't want to talk about it either.

So I want to commend my friend from Ohio who is standing tall for fiscal responsibility. It's clear that there's a distinction between the majority party and the minority party. And the minority party says, the Republicans say, we believe in fiscal responsibility. We believe that we can hold the line on spending to holding it to where it was last year.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. DICKS. And I will say to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) we are, I have already explained, Mr. OBEY's already explained why this amendment is not going to be passed by the House today, because it's too big a cut. And I would just say, again, and I want to say this to every Member: This administration has cut the Interior Department budget over the last 6 to 7 years by 16 percent.

□ 1230

It has cut EPA by 29 percent. It has cut the Forest Service by 35 percent. It is devastating these agencies, and this amendment would add to that devastation.

What we are doing is adding 4.3 percent to try to turn the corner, to try to bring these agencies back. And we are not laying back here. We are just waiting to move on to more important business.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague on the committee, a distinguished member from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

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

The gentleman from Ohio has offered an amendment which is a 4.3 percent across-the-board cut, across all of the agencies here in this bill. And that is about the final desperate or thoughtless way of balancing a budget or of approaching the process of budgeting. After all, the amendments that we have been debating for the last day have been defeated, to throw up your hands, but I suppose that is really progress. At least it is better than trying to reduce the budget down to the level of the President's request in the first place, which was hundreds of millions of dollars even below what the last year's budget was.

But I think you need to look at the core programs. The core programs here are the Department of the Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Forest Service. Those are the major programs in this budget. The budget for 2007 was a very small increase but not as much as an increase up to the inflationary amount from the previous year's budget, the 2006 budget. So we would have had at least 3 years of budgeting below the inflationary level.

The gentleman's amendment would force all those agencies that cover Park Service and Fish and Wildlife Service, which are the places where our Park Service and Fish and Wildlife Service serve most of the public, the millions of people of this country who use those facilities, and it would force them to eat the inflation of that, as of now, over a 2-year period, 2006, 2007, and 2008.

What really is happening is that we are having to try to cover for the enormous reductions in the budget from fiscal 2004 to 2005 and from fiscal 2005 to 2006. That is where the major budget cuts have occurred over the last several years. And this budget only partially, partially, replaces for that enormous cut that occurred in those 2 years, way below inflation, serious, real cuts in dollars way below inflation.

Now, I just want to look at a couple of other things not just 3 or 4 years back but a little bit farther. When President Carter left office, the debt of this country was $1 trillion. Twelve years later, after the presidencies of Ronald Reagan and George Bush, the debt of the country was $4.3 trillion, $3.3 trillion more. When President Clinton left office 8 years later, it was $1.2 trillion above that.

Now, in only 6 years, with you folks on the other side having been in the majority throughout those 6 years, the debt is now up to $8.8 trillion, another $3.5 trillion. Think of it. Under 8 years of President Clinton, the total debt increase was $1.2 trillion, about one-third of the debt increase in just 6 years under the present President and all of that coming under your leadership. The debt increased to that time is all under your majority's leadership.

So I just want to say in the final analysis when you take into account inflation, with this bill, the Department of Interior would still be 11 percent below what the budget was in 2001, when President Bush took office. For the EPA, it would be 16 percent, still below the 2001 budget. And for the Forest Service, it would still be 19 percent below. Those key core programs would still be 19 percent below the budget in 2001.

I oppose this amendment and hope it will not be adopted.

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

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to know which is it? We just heard from the distinguished chairman from Washington that Republicans spent too much; so we are going to spend more. We heard about

the spending by the Republicans. And we just heard from the other gentleman that we cut, cut, cut. I want to know which is it?

All I know is this, what is in the bill, and in the bill it says this: The Commission on Climate Change, $50 million of taxpayer money for this new Commission. National Park Service, a $199 million increase, 10.8 percent above last year. The National Endowment for the Arts, a 29 percent increase. We heard a debate about this yesterday, an agency that many Americans find offensive using their tax dollars: $160 million, a 29 percent increase. National Endowment for the Humanities, $19 million, an increase of 13 percent.

Which is it? Did we cut all the time or did we spend too much? I want to know which it is.

What I do know is that in the bill, there are all kinds of excessive spending. That is why we just want to say hold the line, let's keep it where it is right now.

And I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. MCGOVERN). 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. 29 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. 29 offered by Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

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

TITLE VI—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of $276,330,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 26, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

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

I appreciate the opportunity to offer this amendment. This amendment is what became affectionately known as the Hefley amendment. Mr. Hefley was a former Member of the House and offered a 1 percent decrease in the reduction of the increase on appropriations bills routinely. And he no longer serves with us; so many of us believe that it is an appropriate way to try to bring about some kind of fiscal restraint and fiscal responsibility here in the United States Congress.

I think it is important to look at the big picture, and the big picture is that we always have to remind ourselves whose money this is. And there is a sense in this Chamber and in Washington that this money is the government's money, that the government somehow makes it and discovers it and that it ought to just spend it willy-nilly.

Well, Mr. Chairman, as you know, this isn't the government's money; it is the people's money. This money comes to Washington through the hard work of the American taxpayer. And it is imperative that we remember that because only when we remember that will we have that touchstone to make certain we spend it responsibly.

What are the big numbers here that we are talking about in the Interior, Environment Appropriations bill? Last year, fiscal year 2007, this bill appropriated $26.4 billion. This year the proposal is to spend $27.6 billion. That is an increase of $1.2 billion, an increase of 9.5 percent, an increase three times the rate of inflation.

This amendment would decrease that increase by 1 percent. It would decrease that increase by $276 million. It would trim one penny out of every dollar spent in this appropriations bill. It is the kind of thing that American families all across our Nation do when they find themselves in times when they are spending more than they are taking in, which is what the Federal Government is doing, spending more than we are taking in.

This is a responsible amendment. It starts us down that road of being fiscally responsible. It tells the American people that we care about their budget and in caring about their budget, we will be responsible with the Federal budget. It will begin to restore some of that trust that the American people have lost in Washington's ability to restrain spending.

So I offer this amendment in good faith. I believe it is an appropriate way to begin the process of gaining back fiscal responsibility here in Washington. I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 20 minutes.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of my good friend from Washington if he has any speakers on this amendment?

Mr. DICKS. Yes, we have speakers. How many speakers do you have?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I have got more than my 20 minutes will be able to fill.

Mr. DICKS. I am not going to yield you any time; so you might go ahead and start.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the silence persists. The silence persists on the majority side because they are loathe to defend the spending that is going on here in Washington. Mr. Chairman, I find that particularly offensive to the American people. This is not government's money. It is the American taxpayers' money. It is incumbent upon the party that is proposing to spend billions and billions of dollars to increase the debt ceiling in this Nation over $9 trillion for the first time, to ignore the entitlement spending, to ignore $50 trillion in liability. This is the majority party that is silent, silent when it comes to this kind of spending.

So I would urge my colleagues to reconsider their desire not to defend their spending.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to my good friend from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), who is a leader on fiscal responsibility here in the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

As I listened to the arguments, what arguments that are presented, from the majority Democrats, I hear some things that don't quite ring true. They talk a lot about their pay-as-you-go rules and that their great fiscal accomplishment of this Congress is that they are going to pay for spending as you go. Yet this bill increases spending by $1.2 billion, and it is not paid for. There is no $1.2 billion cut somewhere else. They are simply going to increase the deficit by $1.2 billion more because they have decided they want to spend it.

They say that they are not raising taxes. But yet their budget increases spending every single year for 5 years and then miraculously says they are going to balance the budget. How do they do that? Because they did have in their budget the largest tax increase in American history.

You just heard them recently just decry the former deficits. Oh, my gosh, Republicans drove up these deficits. And, in fact, we did. And we agree that that was not the right thing to do. So what is their response? Make the deficits bigger. Take the spending that we had while we were in charge and increase it by more.

□ 1245

And then they have one other thing they continue to do which is to call something like this bill a ''cut.'' You heard the gentleman from Washington on the last proposal say that it was a devastating cut, when in fact all this does, as the gentleman from Georgia pointed out, is take what's already a 4.5 percent increase and reduce it.

Now, what I want to do is, since they're having a hard time understanding this, I want to put this up graphically so that maybe they will understand better.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here are 100 donkeys. I figured that donkeys were

something that Democrats would be able to relate to. So we have 100 donkeys here. Imagine that this is 100 donkeys of spending. Here's what this bill will do. There, Mr. Chairman, are 99 donkeys; 100 donkeys here, 99 donkeys there. Probably having a hard time, I would imagine, Mr. Chairman, people in the gallery are probably having a hard time telling the difference. That's because there isn't much difference. That's because it isn't a big cut, it isn't a big reduction. If you have a million-dollar program, all we're asking is for that program to get by on $90,000. If it's $100 million, we're asking them to get by on a mere $99 million. If it's a billion-dollar program, do you think that some government agencies can squeak by on $990 million rather than a billion?

But here's the big point: It doesn't look like a lot of difference in donkeys, but if we do that, if we spend the 99 instead of 100 on every single government program, we save $30 billion. That is real money. And this is how you save it: a little bit at a time. Ask a million-dollar program to get by on $990,000, ask a billion-dollar program to get by on 1 percent less. And when you do that with every single program in government, you save $30 billion a year. That, Mr. Chairman, is how we can get to a balanced budget without not only the largest tax increase in American history, without raising taxes on the hardworking people in America at all simply by asking government day by day, get by on 1 percent less. I think we can do it. I think we should vote for this amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, again, the former ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Conte, when he was here in the House of Representatives, used to say that this is the ''meat-ax approach.'' An across-the-board amendment doesn't make any selectivity between the national parks and other issues. It's just an across-the-board cut.

Again, I must say that the reason we object on this particular bill is because over the last 7 years the administration has cut the Interior Department by 16 percent in real terms. And the cut for EPA is 29 percent and that cuts the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act. I mean, it's hard to believe that this administration wanted to cut the Clean Water Revolving Fund by $670 million. How do you do that and go to bed at night and actually get sleep? I mean, it's shocking to me, these cuts.

The Forest Service funds all the programs for taking care of our multiple-use Forest Service land. More recreation is provided by the Forest Service than actually the Park Service, and they cut that by 35 percent since 2001.

This is a crisis. These agencies are headed down a devastating path, not having enough staff to do their work. The refuges didn't have enough staff. The Park Service didn't have enough staff. Every one of these agencies were losing people year after year because their fixed costs weren't covered. So this was a crisis situation.

I think everything we've done in this budget is totally responsible. And I reject the idea of any across-the-board meat-ax approach, using the language of the former ranking member, Mr. Conte from Massachusetts. And I just hope that we can move on here and get to the rest of these amendments.

There are a lot of people on the other side who told me they would like to go home on Friday morning, they would like to see us get done on Thursday night. So I don't want anybody to think that we're not in opposition to all these things. I just want them to know that we're trying to work on a bipartisan basis to get the job of this committee done as quickly as possible.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York, a member of the committee (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the distinguished chairman.

I took note of the gentleman's $30 billion in donkeys. I would like to commend to the gentleman's attention $3 trillion in elephants, which is $3 trillion in debt that the other side built up while they were in control of this Congress; $3 trillion elephants rampaging through the Federal Treasury, crushing our future, strangling them with debt.

Now, the other side has said that they want to cut and we want to spend. Absolutely not true. We've cut these programs. We're being stewards with the people's money. We have eliminated over 200 programs in this project. The real issue is not cutting versus spending; it's priorities. Mr. Chairman, the American people understand priorities.

The other side had no problem finding the money to give Halliburton, in no-bid contracts, unlimited amounts of money to big corporations like Halliburton in no-bid contracts. What we're saying is let's instead invest that money in the Clean Air Act.

The other side had no problem bulldozing to passage billions and billions of dollars in tax cuts for the richest oil company executives on the face of the planet who have made more profits than any company has ever made in the course of human history. What we're saying is let's prioritize differently. Instead of using that money for tax cuts to oil company executives, let's invest it in the Clean Water Act. Let's invest it in the Environmental Protection Agency.

So this isn't just about cutting and spending. This is about priorities that the American people want us to pursue. The same choices that they make at their kitchen tables, in their living rooms, in their dining rooms, in their small businesses are the choices that we're suggesting. Instead of the wasteful spending on the special interests, the pharmaceutical companies, the big oil companies, we're saying let's return some of that money in investments on clean air and clean water.

Mr. DICKS. And I would just add, if the gentlemen are so confident of their position, why don't we just have a vote on this and move along and get the committee's work done.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate the attempt at defending the remarkable increased spending on the part of the majority party. To describe this amendment as a devastating cut is curious. Only in Washington is a decrease in the increase a cut.

It's important that the American people appreciate that the proposal of the majority party is to spend in this bill $27.6 billion. This amendment, if enacted would provide for the spending of $27.4 billion, hardly, Mr. Chairman, a devastating cut.

I would also ask my good friend from Washington to simply read the amendment. It talks about an across-the-board cut. The amendment states that ''appropriations made by this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of $276 million.'' That's not an across-the-board cut. That's a 1 percent reduction in the total allocation in this bill. So it is disingenuous of my good friend to make those kinds of comments.

I would also say that he says that we need to move quickly. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that any time we spend defending the American taxpayer is time well spent.

And then they talk about priorities. Mr. Chairman, the correct priority we have is defending the American taxpayer.

I am pleased to yield 1 minute to my good friend from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia for yielding 1 minute.

The distinguished colleague who just spoke from New York made a good point about the deficit being too large. I agree with him 100 percent on that. But now is the chance to step up to the plate. Now is the chance we can do something about adding to the deficit.

The bill in front of us goes $1.9 billion more than what the President has requested and $1.2 billion more than last year's amount. So we have a chance now to do something about building up the deficit. So if we're sincere about being concerned about it, now is the chance to actually do something.

A 1 percent cut allows the committee to do the work of prioritizing and making sure that the money goes to the most critical programs and has the chance to reprioritize and take away some of the fat. And I would suggest that we do not need for the National Endowment of the Arts an increase of $35 million, or 29 percent; 29 percent more than last year. We have a lot of room to cut this bill.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 9 minutes remaining and

the gentleman from Washington has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend and colleague from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I was listening to my good friend and colleague from New York who just spoke about the debt that we built up under the Republican leadership; I think he mentioned the number $3 trillion. And I don't think that's admirable on our part.

I want to say that I think most Members know that I'm a big fan of country music and one of my favorite singers is Randy Travis, and one of my favorite songs is ''Diggin Up Bones.'' The American people don't want us to be digging up bones and saying, well, you did this, or he hit me back first. I think what our colleagues on the other side of the aisle need to remember, the fact that we are now in the minority is not so much about the miscreant action of a couple of Members on our side who violated the public trust or the difficult slog in Iraq. That slog has been difficult. But more importantly, it's this debt that has been built up, this fiscal irresponsibility.

This Republican Study Committee, the majority of the minority, and I'm proud of my Members on this side of the aisle that said enough is enough, the American people want us to stop spending their money.

I support this amendment, a 1 percent cut across the board. It's not specifically so much about this particular appropriations bill, but it's about all of them. We have got to stop this nonsense spending once and for all. This is the time to draw the line in the sand, just like our colleague from Colorado, the esteemed Representative Mr. Hefley, did every year, 1 percent across-the-board cut. I'm embarrassed that I didn't vote for all those amendments, but I strongly support my colleague from Georgia in this amendment.

And as my other colleague from Georgia said, to spend just $1 billion, you could spend $1 a second for the next 31 years to get to this expenditure of $1 billion.

Support the amendment.

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

Mr. OLVER. I thank the gentleman from the subcommittee for yielding me the time.

I'm interested by the amendment. Now, as the gentleman from Georgia has explained it, I, of course, had thought that without instruction the amendment would end up being an across-the-board amendment. But what in fact has happened here is that the gentleman's amendment, without instruction, allows the executive to decide exactly where those $276 million would be cut.

Now, I would consider that a total abrogation of our responsibility for budgeting in article I of the Constitution, where we have taken an oath of office to the Constitution, and where our responsibility is to define where the budgeting for the country will go.

So I think that's, in fact, a far worse thing than it would be if it were a strictly across-the-board kind of budget, senseless as though that would be.

I often find it necessary to be a little bit repetitious. I just want to go back to something that I had pointed out, and that is, that at the end of the Carter administration, when President Carter left office in January of 1981, the debt of this country was $1 trillion. Twelve years later, after 8 years of President Reagan and four of President Bush, father, the debt of the country was $4.3 trillion, more than four times as large in 12 years, but $3.3 trillion increase. In 8 years of President Clinton, the debt was increased by an additional $1.2 trillion to $5.5 trillion.

□ 1300

After now 6 years of Bush, the son, as President, the debt, at present, is at $8.8 trillion, an additional $3½ trillion in just 6 years

Now, I don't know, the gentlemen and women on the other side of the aisle were in the majority through all of those 6 years in this House of Representatives which starts all the budgets. They can't claim that they were out to lunch at all because, in fact, they were here voting for those budgets that increased the debt by $3½ trillion over the last 6 years. So if there is fiscal responsibility, it certainly cannot be claimed either then or now for what is now the minority in this House of Representatives.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), the Chair of the Republican Study Committee and the champion of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I thank him for his leadership in the Republican Study Committee and his leadership for fiscal sanity in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee is no longer on the floor. I have listened to his comments carefully. He alluded to some of the debate being part fiction. Well, I must admit, when I have my Democrat colleagues come to the floor and lecture on the subject of fiscal responsibility, I do feel like we are in the midst of a chapter in ''Alice in Wonderland.'' We hear our friends from this side of the aisle lecture us, well, it was you Republicans who voted for these budgets that increased spending.

Well, Mr. Chairman, again, you are entitled to your own opinions. You are not entitled to your own facts. Look at the record. Every time that the Republicans offered a budget that spent more money, Democrats offered a budget that spent even more. It spent even more. Look at the record. You have Democrats come to the floor, Mr. Chairman, and say, well, the Republicans are responsible for this very expensive prescription drug benefit program.

Well, they are right. But guess what? Their program cost even more. It cost even more. Then they say, well, under your watch, the national debt went up by $3 trillion. Well, the unfunded obligations, the debt that will be imposed on our children and grandchildren for their refusal to do anything about out-of-control entitlement spending, is $50 trillion. $50 trillion.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would be more than happy to take responsibility for $3 trillion when my friends from the other side of the aisle will take responsibility for the $50 trillion. They had nothing, absolutely nothing, stone-cold silence on entitlement spending in their budget, something that the Comptroller General says we are on the verge of being the first generation of American history to leave the next generation with a lower standard of living. When will the madness stop?

Then I hear about these devastating cuts. How about the devastating cuts to the American family when their largest tax increase in American history is imposed? How about those devastating cuts? Then we hear about this meat-cleaver approach of an across-the-board cut. Well, my friends from the other side of the aisle didn't have any problem with a meat-cleaver cut of the American family budget of $3,000 per American family. How about that meat-cleaver cut?

What I am essentially hearing here, and I know much good work has been done on this bill, but I am hearing ''NIMBY.'' Sure, maybe there is a big entitlement crisis here, but ''not in my backyard.'' It needs to begin today.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I think people should understand that the views that are being enunciated here are not the views of the bipartisan appropriations subcommittee that I serve on. Mr. TIAHRT and Mr. DICKS have worked very hard to produce a bill that I think is an excellent product. It really answers the question these gentlemen have raised earlier: What is this bill about? Because what they are talking about cutting, folks, is cutting to the heart of what the American people love.

Let's talk a little bit about that. They want to talk about 1 percent, 4 percent and all of that. But they don't want to talk about what they are really cutting.

Now, the National Wildlife Refuges, the American people love. This administration is talking about closing down 200 National Wildlife Refuges because we don't have any personnel in them. So you want to continue that. The speakers here today want to continue

those cuts and close down National Wildlife Refuges.

If you ask the American people, do they love their American parks and do they want rangers to be there to service them? The American people are going to say, yes, of course, they do. Well, these gentlemen want to cut them. That is what is going on here. They want to cut the parks and cut park personnel. There is a huge backlog in the parks. They don't want to do anything about it. They want to cut further.

The other part of this bill which is very, very important, is we are always hearing about local communities needing water and sewer. Your side always talks about mandates. Well, this bill is about giving local communities water and sewer grants through the EPA so that they can clean up so that cities don't have to be polluters.

So, we ought to get a little question in reality here when it comes to the fringe element that is coming out here, not the bipartisan subcommittee that put this together.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time available on each side?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has 4 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Massachusetts has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, given the discrepancy in the times, to equalize the time, I will reserve my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate a couple of points, because we seem to be having this debate every week. It seems to be on the same issues we have always been talking about. But I find it not necessarily enjoyable, but an obligation, to get up and communicate to the American taxpayer and the citizens of this country that over the last 6 years, the Republican House, Republican Senate, Republican White House, borrowed $3 trillion. They asked the Treasury Department to raise the debt limit five or six times to allow them to go out and borrow more money.

You borrowed it from China. You borrowed it from Japan. You borrowed it from OPEC countries. On and on and on and on. All of a sudden, 5 or 6 months into this year, before we have even passed a budget, you are lecturing us on fiscal responsibility.

I want the taxpayers, Mr. Chairman, to keep their forms from this year and compare them to their tax forms next year. They will see absolutely no increase in their taxes whatsoever. None. Zero. So, there is not a tax increase in this 2008 budget.

Now, let's talk about what you are proposing to cut with this amendment.

Superfund sites. Okay, you want to cut the Superfund site program that is going to clean up the most toxic sites. In many of the old industrial areas like mine, the gentleman knows very well, they were polluted in the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s. We can't develop the local economy because where we have water lines and where we have sewer lines, they are contaminated.

Quite frankly, the city of Youngstown and the city of Warren do not have millions of dollars to put into this because their tax base has eroded. If you want us to contribute to the tax base like we did in the 1930s, 1940s and 1950s when, quite frankly, a lot of that money that was taken out of Youngstown, Ohio, was used to develop the West and to develop new water lines and sewer lines in the South in many of your districts, all we are asking is for a little bit of help.

□ 1315

Help us clean up the brownfield sites.

How about your cutting the methamphetamine prevention and treatment program? I am sure you can't wait to get back to your districts and tell that to your constituents. How about those of you in the West fighting wildfires? You are going to cut that program.

Mr. Chairman, many will say there are not any cuts in this bill. There are cuts in this bill: $193 million cut from construction account, it eliminates $31 million for landowner incentives; $39 million cut for the EPA Mexican border program; $24 million cut from the EPA Alaska Village setaside; $24 million cut from the Indiana land consolidation. There are cuts in here. We are not raising taxes. We are making investments into our community.

Just because, Mr. Chairman, the minority party raised the debt $3 trillion, just because the minority party is ashamed, quite frankly, of their behavior over the past 6 years doesn't mean that they can displace all of their shamefulness on the new Democratic majority. I wouldn't want to admit that I borrowed $3 trillion from Japan and China either. I would run from it as fast as I could. But that doesn't change the facts.

So I think we should vote down this amendment. There are great investments for local communities all over the country in this bill, and I think we should keep it.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), a champion for fiscal responsibility and fiscal reform in Washington.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a real test here. We all campaign every 2 years, and we put out campaign literature. We go speak at town halls and other events. And I would venture to guess that not one person in this body said, Reelect me because we need to spend more on Interior appropriations. We need to spend more. We need to spend 4 percent more than we did last year. I am going to go back to Washington and spend $1.2 billion more than we did last year.

I venture that nobody said that. Virtually everybody said we need to rein in spending. We need to promote fiscal responsibility.

I am the first to concede we didn't do a good job of it over here. For the past several years we have grown government far too big. That is part of the reason we are now in the minority. But the majority comes now and says, don't lecture us, we are going to increase that spending.

This bill spends $1.2 billion more than last year. Last year spent too much. This year spends too much too much again.

So, please, we know we did wrong. That is why we are in the minority. But when you are in the majority now, let's exercise some fiscal discipline. There are plenty of areas that can receive cuts. We have outlined several of them over the past several hours with amendments.

Museum funding, part of the reason the gentleman from New Mexico mentioned that we have a backlog at the National Parks, he is right. But yet in the authorizing committee, we have created several more National Heritage Areas and earmarked a lot more money for them. There are earmarks in this bill for National Heritage Areas. That is money that will come out of the National Parks budget. They will tell you if you spend money here on this new area, this National Heritage Area, you can't spend money maintaining the parks that we already have. Many of us have fought to stop that. We have said don't keep creating these National Heritage Areas. Yet with the new majority, we are creating them at a faster rate than we ever have.

I would say, let's promote fiscal discipline. Let's pass this amendment.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to speak to the gentleman who has just spoken. I commend the gentleman who has just spoken. I think he has taken a very responsible, very serious approach to budgeting over the last several sessions, and I appreciate that sort of thing very much.

But I would say that here we are in this instance with an amendment that takes an approach not quite across-the-board, but gives the total responsibility off to the President of the United States to decide where to make any cuts he wishes to make, which, I repeat, is an abrogation of our responsibility under the Constitution that we take an oath to.

I would say that also this is a bad approach because after 40 amendments, each of which has been defeated, and 40 amendments which have had so little merit to them that they have been defeated, many of them by roll call votes, by roll call votes, and the sum total of all those amendments was considerably more than the $276 million, to now throw up your hands and try to do it in

a different way, in that kind of a meat-ax approach, to use those words, is not a good thing to do. It is not an appropriate budgeting thing to do.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to commend my friend, not only for his athletic ability and his talents on the basketball court, but also for his focus and discipline in regards to this issue.

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I would just say, I have three amendments that have not been voted on yet, so I invite the gentleman to support them.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, in the city of Akron, which I represent a part of, their obligation for the EPA is $400 million in the city of Akron. Our friends on the other side are saying that there is no role for the Federal Government to play.

You have communities like Akron, you have communities like Youngstown that have lost significant industry over the past 20 or 30 years; and if we want to bring industry back, if we want to grow industry, we can't have brownfields all over our cities.

This is an investment. This is going to clean the site up. This is an opportunity for us to redevelop sites in our communities.

Now, 30 years ago when the steel mills were pumping, when the rubber industry was pumping, a lot of our tax dollars were going to many of your communities to help lay down roads, build the interstate, rail lines, water infrastructure, all of these things. What this bill does is it tries to reinvest back into some of these communities. We want to be self-sufficient, but we don't have the local tax base. There is a role here for the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my friends, why would you want to prevent us from cleaning up brownfield sites in the old industrial areas? We don't need it forever. We just need to clean them up, and then we will have a tax base there and have more taxpayers to pay taxes and keep the tax rates low for everybody, because we will have more. But if we can't develop these sites, it becomes very, very difficult for us to grow our local economy.

We need the Federal Government to make these investments, and that is exactly what this bill does.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on each side, if I may?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has 2 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Massachusetts has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the Chair.

I just would point out to my good friend from Ohio that no specific programs are identified in this decrease in the increase. So to identify specific programs is a spurious argument, truly.

I would also say that this points out fundamentally the difference between the two parties. We believe fundamentally that individuals spend their money more wisely than the government. It is clear that the majority party does not believe that. They believe that they spend the taxpayer money much more wisely. We just think that is a fundamental difference.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield the balance of my time to my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), on this appropriate amendment of fiscal responsibility.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I just walked in a moment ago. I was on the streets of Washington, D.C. where the heat is truly on this Nation's Capital in the high nineties and the humidity is also in the high nineties, and here we come to the inside of Chambers, where the heat is being put on, on the American taxpayer and the American family; but this time it is being placed on them by the Democrats and majority party.

Six months into control by the Democrats, and what have they wrought for this Nation? The largest tax increase in U.S. history; an attempt to change the rules on the American public going back to 1820; and last week, of course, we saw as well the idea by the Democrats that they should have some sort of slush fund where your tax dollars go unequated for.

When you look at the basic math I was trying to do here, look at the equation, what they give us is this: a tax increase plus a spending increase leads to an answer of an increased burden on the American taxpayer.

I have had the opportunity now to serve on the Budget Committee for 4 years; and during that time the Democrats, when they were in the minority, railed against us time after time saying we were spending too much. I thought that railing would stop once they were in the majority and they had the opportunity to go in the other direction. But as we have seen here, the railing has not stopped. They continue to point to the past about increased spending, but they then at the same token, out of their same mouths, what do they do? They increase spending on the American public again.

If the problem in the past was that the U.S. Government was spending too much, you would think that the simple solution to that, the simple answer to that math equation, would be spend less. But this budget does not do that. This spending bill does not do that. That is why I support the gentleman from Georgia's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington resumes control of the time.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I just want to respond to the gentleman from Georgia who said the individual taxpayers can spend their money better than government. The taxpayers in my district can't clean a brownfield, go out with 50 bucks and clean a brownfield. This is something we need to do collectively as a community and as a country, to clean that up. Individuals can't do that.

Individuals couldn't build the interstate highways and the railroads and the Panama Canal and all the great infrastructure projects that we have had. We need help to do this in some communities so we can be self-sufficient, and individuals can't do that.

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

Mr. Chairman, again I want to say to my colleagues, the reason we have to make this increase in the Interior appropriations budget is because over the last 6 or 7 years the budgets for these agencies have been reduced dramatically. The Interior Department has been cut by 16 percent. We have lost rangers at every national park in the Nation. The summer workers have been cut back. The services there are not as good as they used to be.

This was a crisis. The National Parks Conservation Association had a pamphlet, ''The Endangered Ranger.'' Here it was, our national parks, our national treasure, in decline.

I am no extremist. I am a moderate in this House, and I always have been. But this was a true crisis. And what we had to do was stop this decline, this downward trend of our national wildlife refuges, our national parks, and we put a little extra money in to get it turned up, so we could hire a few more people, so we could cover the fixed costs of the rangers and the people running these wildlife refuges.

That is why we had to do this. It was a crisis. And it is going to take us a number of years to get back. We only increased this budget by 4.3 percent. With a 16-percent cut, it would take 4 years to get back to where we were in 2001. With EPA, it would take about 7 years to get back to where we were. And with a 35-percent cut in the Forest Service, it would take about 8 years to get back. So we have a long ways to go, and I don't want to have any downward direction here.

I do say to the gentleman from Georgia that he is right, the 1 percent could be taken anywhere, and that might mean that all of the projects of interest to the Members would be eliminated by the administration. Now, I hope they wouldn't do that. I hope they wouldn't fall into that trap. But that is one possibility.

So, again, I resent the gentleman from Georgia even suggesting that we aren't over here fighting against your amendments. We just looked at the

RECORD last night and how the votes went, and we thought maybe some of the Members would like to get home on Thursday.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, and I can guarantee I think that this amendment will be treated properly by the membership.

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. 27 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. 27 offered by Mrs. MUSGRAVE:

Page 110, after line 18, insert the following new section:

SEC. 417. 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 26, 2007, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reduce the overall funding of this bill by .5 percent, one-half of 1 percent. We already know that the increased funding in this bill over the last year's appropriations is an additional $1.2 billion, 4.5 percent. So my amendment would take a 4.5 percent increase to a 4 percent increase. That is not a cut. If you look up the word ''cut'' in the dictionary, this is still an increase in spending of 4 percent.

We have a national debt that is at an all-time high, $8.8 trillion. I walk around in the Longworth House Office Building where my office is and I see these charts on easels out in front of Members' offices and they are decrying the national debt. I look at my children and my grandchildren and I am very concerned about this $8.8 trillion. I think we are leaving a terrible legacy to our children and our grandchildren. I hear my friends on the other side of the aisle, and I want to say that you are right when you decry the spending levels that the Republicans reached while we were in the majority.

But I want to take it back to a time when I was a teacher, and someone in the class would do something and you would try to correct this student and they would say, But he is doing it too. And you would say, It is still wrong. You are doing it. You stop it. And then you deal with this person over here.

Republicans spent too much. Democrats want to spend even more, Mr. Chairman. But as we are standing here today debating these amendments, and some people think we need to hurry up and go home, I think the American people need to hear this debate.

I heard the distinguished chairman talking about a meat-ax approach that a Republican chairman had alluded to before years ago. I would say that the Musgrave amendment is just a shave, Mr. Chairman. It is a shave that won't even give you a rash. It is 50 cents on $100. That is very appropriate.

When we look at this bill, we hear things that are very worthy of taxpayer spending in this bill. But we also hear other things.

This bill contains $204 million for land acquisition. If you take a map of the United States, Mr. Chairman, and you look and see how much land the government already owns west of the Mississippi, if you look at that map, it is staggering. I am very concerned about how the Federal Government already owns too much land.

Again, in this bill there is $204 million for land acquisition. I have friends in the Western Caucus, and I am a member of it, and we talk about what happens to communities when this property is owned by the Federal Government, what happens to the revenue stream.

This bill also has something else that is especially egregious to me, $160 million in funding for the National Endowment for the Arts, a 29 percent increase over the amount that was appropriated last year. I love the arts and I know that these things are noble. But, do you know what? When I talk to a family in Sterling, Colorado, a farming community out there in northeastern Colorado, I would have a very hard time convincing them that they need to be taxed at a higher rate, to send their hard-earned dollars to Washington, D.C. so that money can be handed out for theater productions in Sitka, Alaska. I don't think the family in Sterling, Colorado, would get that.

□ 1330

So I think when we talk about the good things in this bill, we also have to look at these egregious things and talk about choices we should make.

So again, I want to trim this. I want to give this a shave of one-half of 1 percent, which, by the way, in dollar amounts, ends up being $138 million, just a shave off of this bill, to exercise discipline in our spending just like the families back home have to do to meet their budgets.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I just want to say a couple of things. I know, Mr. Chairman, people watching this on TV probably think they are in the Twilight Zone or caught up in the middle of Alice in Wonderland because you don't know which side to believe.

The chairman of the subcommittee said people couldn't sleep or wouldn't be able to sleep worrying about these cuts. Nobody in Grantville, Georgia, will be staying up worrying about the government cutting its own size.

We are talking about saving time. We have been debating for about 14 hours $28 billion. I don't know about anybody on the other side of the aisle, but I know that when me and my family sit down and discuss a budget, it took a lot longer for us to discuss our little pittance of a budget than 14 hours to discuss $27 billion.

The other thing, we are hearing all of this whining about we borrowed $3 trillion in the last 6 years. We ran up the deficit. And then we hear about we cut the budget $16 billion. Now listen, where I come from, you can't have your cake and eat it, too. We were either wrong in borrowing the money, or we were wrong in not spending the money, but you can't be wrong in both of them. Somebody has to make up their mind.

We talked the other night that you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

I would like to say that I think the majority is running out of time, because pretty soon, the gig is going to be up. We tried pinpointing, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. FLAKE, we tried pinpointing, doing some accurate bombing or cutting on this bill; but that didn't work.

Now it's being talked about using the meat-cleaver approach. When I get those 250 programs that have been cut and the $6 billion that has been saved, and the list of the $80 billion that we are spending more, could you send me maybe a method to do some cutting? Because if we can't pinpoint, we can't use a scalpel, and we can't use a meat cleaver, how can we do it? I think that is what the taxpayers want to know. Who is going to stand up for them?

We call each other ''my good friend'' and ''my good buddy'' and ''my colleague'' and this and that. What we need to be doing is being a good friend to the taxpayer. We are not being a good friend to the taxpayer.

We talk about national parks being closed down, and yet we spend another $7 million expanding the Carl Sandburg property.

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

This amendment would cut a total of $138 million from environmental conservation and Native American programs. It makes no choice based on need or merit of the program, but it cuts 0.5 percent in this bill. This is not merely an accounting change on a table. Cutting $138 million from the bill will have very serious consequences.

All of us have been listening on television about the big wild fire at Lake Tahoe. This bill would reduce overall funding for firefighting by $14 million at a time when we are facing what is potentially one of the worst fire seasons in history. It cuts 125 firefighters, shuts down firefighter stations, and significantly reduces air tanker support. It would decimate preparedness efforts by failing to provide critical support for initial attacks, and could allow as many as 80 more wildfires to escalate. This would lead to larger, more damaging and much more expensive fires, costing in excess of $20 million to extinguish.

This amendment halts hazardous fuel reduction projects without which there is little hope for reducing long-term fire costs and harmful impacts.

In our national parks, it cuts overall National Park Service funding by $13 million, includes a $6 million reduction below the President's request for the basic operational cost of the 391 units of the national park system.

It drastically impacts the President's proposal to hire 3,000 seasonal and 600 full-time park ranger positions.

For Native American programs, it rejects $29 million for programs that have received bipartisan support. By cutting $16 million out of Indian health care programs, this proposal would deny service to thousands of Native Americans.

It takes 4 percent out of the already struggling Indian education programs leaving even more Indian children without adequate education programs.

For the Environmental Protection Agency, it reduces a total of $40 million for EPA. Funding for efforts to help local communities with repairs to their aging water and wastewater infrastructure, would be reduced by almost $10 million from fiscal year 2007 enacted levels. This would mean that many communities would not receive the financial assistance they need to repair and improve water and sewer infrastructure.

Despite the fact that 76 million Americans live within 4 miles of a toxic waste site, the amendment cuts almost $8 million from programs to clean up the Nation's most toxic and hazardous waste sites. It reduces the amount for restoration and protection of America's great water bodies, including the Chesapeake Bay, Great Lakes, Puget Sound, and others. It would especially jeopardize the cleanup of toxic sediments in the lakes, and community efforts across this Nation to protect 28 estuaries.

For the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service the cuts here would be $7 million for an agency which has already lost 600 staff positions since 2004. And means that many of our wildlife refuges today have no staff whatsoever because of the devastating cuts that have been imposed over the last 7 years.

It would perpetuate staffing shortfall trends and reduce public service by taking funding out of the National Wildlife Refuge System.

Forest Service. This amendment reduces funding for the non-fire portion of the Forest Service by $13 million. Forces up to 100 employee layoffs and closures of more than 10 campgrounds while reducing fire improvement activities on several thousand acres.

It diminishes cooperative land conservation and forestry actions which serve thousands of nonindustrial private forest landowners.

It freezes research efforts and compels the closure of at least four labs.

So these are, I think, very substantial and important reductions that would adversely affect this bill. I have a great regard for the gentlelady. As much as I enjoy and appreciate her, I can't accept this amendment. I want her to know it is nothing personal, it is just that we have to do the job.

We are in a recovery mode here. That is what I tried to explain. The gentleman who talked about the $16 billion, it wasn't $16 billion, it was a 16 percent reduction in the funding for the Department of the Interior. This has had a devastating impact. We also had a 29 percent reduction in EPA and a 35 percent reduction in the Forest Service budget. All of these budgets have been hit hard. Only the Department of Labor has been hit worse.

What we are trying to do is stop this downward trend in the personnel in these agencies. The Park Service budget, 80 to 90 percent of the budget are for people. That is why we are so concerned about this. Without the people, the American people when they go to the parks are not going to have the kind of experience that they should have. That's why we have tried to stop this.

The Secretary of the Interior, he got it. I told him, I said you cannot succeed, Mr. Secretary, unless you get 100 percent of fixed costs covered in your budget for the Park Service, for the Fish and Wildlife Service, for the Bureau of Land Management, the Mineral Management Agency, and he did that. But we have to recover over a period of time.

Unfortunately, to make further reductions will take us longer before we can restore the services at our national parks, and restore service at our national wildlife refuges. This is a very well put-together bill. I just regret that these cuts are being offered. I think this bill should be accepted as it is. We have to go to conference, obviously we know that. So I rise in very strong opposition to this amendment.

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

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlelady for yielding me this time, and for bringing this fine amendment forward and for her work on fiscal responsibility in her time here in the United States Congress.

I want to make a couple of quick points here. First, the list that the chairman just went through, he kept using the term ''cut.'' Let's be clear to the American people in particular that the gentlelady's amendment is not a cut, it is an increase of 4 percent. What the gentleman was referring to was the spending levels at 4.5 percent which the bill contains within it. All she is saying is let's increase 4 percent instead of 4.5 percent. Again, only in government-speak, only in Washington can that be termed a cut. She is not cutting at all. She is just saying let's not increase it quite as much.

A couple of other things we have heard in the course of the debate this afternoon which I think has been healthy. The chairman indicated that he wants to move on, we need to limit debate and get out of here. Look, 40 minutes on three amendments, 2 hours total on debate, on the most fundamental question, the most fundamental issue the United States Congress deals with: How we spend the taxpayers' money. So 2 hours debate on what level that should be is not too much debate. Frankly, we should have more on this fundamental question.

The other point that the majority party makes is, and again, I find this logic fascinating. Republicans spent too much, so we are going to spend even more. It is amazing that is the logic that the other size entails and brings forward in each of these appropriations bills.

Talking about the spending contained within this bill, let me just cite a couple of things.

The Commission on Climate Change, a brand new commission, $50 million on the Commission on Climate Change, adaptation and mitigation, a new, additional study on global warming, as if we haven't had enough studies on that already. So $50 million on that.

The National Park Service, $199 million increase, 10.8 percent above last year.

National Endowment for the Humanities, $19 million increase, 13 percent above last year.

Environmental Protection Agency, the Agency that the gentleman said that if it didn't get the right amount of funding, people would lose sleep over, $361 million, or a 4.7 percent increase above last year.

And of course, my favorite, and I am sure the favorite of the American taxpayer, National Endowment for the Arts, a $35 million increase, 29 percent above last year.

There is all kinds of additional government contained in this legislation. I am reminded of the old statement by our third President, Thomas Jefferson. He said: ''When government fears the people, there is liberty. When people fear the government, there is tyranny.'' Now keep that statement in mind and ask yourself the question: If next week when we are back home on break and you are at some friend's business and someone walks up to the

door and knocks on the door and the individual identifies himself, I'm Mr. Smith and I am from the EPA, the Agency that gets a 4.7-percent increase in this bill. If you are that individual who owns that business, is your first response, oh, joy, one of my government's servants is about here to help me today.

That is what this debate is about, and 2 hours debate on the most fundamental question that the United States Congress deals with, how we spend taxpayer dollars, is not too much debate.

We should debate this long and hard and we should support the amendment of the gentlewoman from Colorado. It simply slows down the rate of government growth, slows down that government that Jefferson warned us about in his statement. I certainly support the gentlelady's amendment, and thank her for bringing it forward.

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

□ 1345

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to give my friend from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) 2 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, as a Member of Congress who supports the protection of our national parks and as an individual from the very crowded State of New Jersey who is seeking to make sure that we preserve the open space of this country as best we can, I rise in support of the gentlelady from Colorado's amendment which would increase spending on these worthwhile causes by 4 percent.

You know, the American public who watches this debate right now might wonder sometimes, do we have a schizophrenic state of mind by the majority party in control today? Out of their mouths come one thing now and something else later on. What is white is black, what is day is night. One moment we are railing against and saying spending, spending, spending is the problem and it's been the problem of the Republican Party for years and years and it still is their problem. Just a moment later, we hear that spending is not the problem from the other side. The problem all these years has been cuts, cuts, cuts. The problem that we have now is that we've been cutting too much in the past. Which is it?

The American public must do as I do sometimes when they hear the debate from the other side of the aisle and scratch their head. Which are the facts that they want to go by today? Is it the problem that we've been spending too much, as the other side of the aisle says? Or is the problem, as the gentleman just recently said, that we were cutting too much?

I would argue that the problem has been that we've been spending too much of the taxpayers' dollars in an unaccountable manner. And the budget that has come before us would give the American taxpayer the largest tax increase in U.S. history.

The amendment from the gentlelady from Colorado would try to do things on an even and moderate manner. It would still increase spending by 4 percent so that all the worthwhile programs in the bill that's before us would be able to be continued to be fully funded at the necessary levels. But at the same time, the gentlelady from Colorado takes in mind the efforts of the American taxpayers to make sure that we will not have the largest tax increase in American history on that family.

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

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the committee chairman if he has any more speakers.

Mr. DICKS. I may have one more speaker. I think I have the right to close, don't I?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. MCGOVERN). The gentleman from Washington has the right to close.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining for both sides.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman has 6½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Washington has 13 minutes remaining.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. I thank the gentlelady from Colorado.

You know, we have heard a lot today from the majority party whenever we talk about this amendment, this bill, this spending, they want to bring up last year's bills, last year's spending. We acknowledge, last year's spending was too much. Last year's bills were too much. That's not what we're talking about. It's like the baseball team wanting to play last year's season again. Look what we did last year. Look what happened last year. No, we're in the middle of this year. We're in the middle of this season. It doesn't matter who won the World Series last year. It matters who's in first place this year. What matters is this year. How much are we going to spend this year? That's what we're voting on. How much are we going to increase the deficit this year? How much further are we going to raid the Social Security surplus this year? That's the question before us. And we think we ought to have the deficit increase a little less and that we should raid the Social Security surplus a little less and that we shouldn't set up a situation where you're going to raise taxes on all of the American people.

The previous amendment, I showed a couple of charts. The previous amendment was to reduce spending by 1 percent. I tried to point out to the majority that it's like this. Here are 100 donkeys, something they can understand. If we reduce that by 1 percent, we have 99 donkeys. Not that big a difference in donkeys. And so we proposed an amendment last time, which the majority party defeated on voice vote, will undoubtedly defeat later, that said, let's just get by on 99 donkeys, money, instead of 100 donkeys, money. Well, they said they couldn't do it.

So the gentlelady from Colorado offers an alternative, which is get by on 99½ donkeys. If I had a half donkey, I would stick it up there. You can pick whichever end of the donkey you want, but put another half a donkey on that chart. And so we're saying rather than 100 donkeys, get by with 99½. It's just saying if you have a million-dollar program, we said, well, get by on 999,000. They're saying, no. Okay. How about $999,500? If you have a $100 million program, we're saying can you get by on $99 million. They said, no. We're saying, okay, how about $99½ million.

That's what this argument is about. Just asking for a half a percent, each government agency, each government program to deal with a half a percent less. People at home make these kinds of decisions with way bigger percentages than that all the time, Mr. Chairman. And if we do it, if we reduce it by 1 percent, we would save $30 billion if we did every program every year. If it's a half a percent, it's still $15 billion. That is real money, Mr. Chairman. Real money no matter how you cut it. And that is the way we can balance this budget without raising taxes.

There, Mr. Chairman, is the big difference between the majority Democratic Party and the Republican Party. We're saying, get by on 99 donkeys or 99½ donkeys instead of 100. Tell government bureaucrats that we can balance this budget without raising taxes. They, however, want to give the bureaucrats 100 donkeys of spending every time and raise taxes on the American people to make up the difference. That's what we're talking about here. That's the difference in this debate. That's the difference between these parties.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge all Members to vote to make government bureaucrats deal with a tiny bit less and let people save and keep their own money.

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, how much time is left?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Colorado has 3 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Washington State has 13 minutes remaining.

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

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

Mr. TIAHRT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I come in support of my friend from Colorado's amendment that would reduce this by one-half of 1 percent below the spending levels of last year.

Over the last 6 months, the new majority has passed or paved the way for $103.5 billion of increased spending. I

guess actually, to be technically correct, it's $103.4 billion. While $0.1 billion may not matter here, it sure matters in America. $103.4 billion in new spending.

We have already enacted over a $6 billion increase in the continuing resolution for this year. We added $17 billion in unrequested funding to spend in the supplemental for this year. And now we're beginning this process of moving toward the additional $80.3 billion added to spending on this year's budget.

$100 billion is a huge amount of money. Today we're considering the Interior and Environment appropriations bill that really makes a good portion of that increase happen right here. This bill increases spending by almost 5 percent over last year's level, $1.2 billion of new spending.

And here, if you look at this spending thermometer, we're halfway up to what may be the taxpayer's boiling point. Somebody has to pay the bill. Somebody has to produce the revenue. Some American family is going to have to have a little less take-home pay because government wanted just a little bit more here, a little bit more there, a little bit more everywhere else.

And all my good friend from Colorado's amendment does is say, let's reduce spending here by one-half of 1 percent. Let's reduce spending by $138 million and still see if we can't do the things that need to be done in this appropriations bill in the right way. If you add this increase to the increases already proposed and passed over the past 2 weeks, we're spending $23.8 billion more than last year.

I rise in strong support of this amendment. I respect both the chairman and the ranking member of the committee and believe that they've done a good job with this bill, but I believe you could do that same job, I think you could do the same job, produce the same results with asking the American taxpayers not to have to carry a burden of 4½ percent new spending in this part of the budget. And so I strongly recommend that we take this, what may seem like a slight reduction here, but when families have to start paying that $138 million in additional taxes, it's a big deal for American families. It should be a big deal for us.

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

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

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

Mr. OBEY. I would like to make a few comments on the remarks of my friend from Missouri. We've just heard an expression of deep concern about the so-called runaway spending in this bill and other appropriation bills. And we've heard deep concern expressed about how this is going to hurt the average taxpayer.

Well, I would like to compare priorities. They've talked about our budget. I would like to talk about theirs, although I must admit that in 3 of the last 6 years, they couldn't even pass one. We passed a budget. In 3 out of the last 6 years, they couldn't even pass their own budget because of internal squabbles between themselves. But I want to talk about the budget that they attempted to pass. The budget that we're operating under was signed by the President, passed by a Republican Congress, and this year will give over $50 billion in tax cuts to people who make over a million bucks a year. That seems to be the top priority of folks on the other side of the aisle, to preserve that high-roller tax cut above all else.

Well, let me tell you what we think should be higher priorities. They've attacked us because of what we did in the continuing resolution last year and they attack us for what we're trying to do in this bill today. I plead fully guilty of trying to add, in fact we did add almost $4 billion of additional funding for veterans health care. I see no sense of shared sacrifice in this country when it comes to the war. Only military families are being asked to pay a price. We decided that we ought to at least see to it that veterans are taken care of when they come home. So we added $4 billion.

Then you bet! We added some more so-called ''runaway spending,'' so that middle-class kids could get more help to go to college by raising the Pell Grants. Now, I've never had anybody in my district say, ''Why don't you guys get your act together and cut cancer research?'' But that's exactly what the Republican-controlled Congress did in the last 2 years. They cut health grants, research grants at the NIH, over 500 grants. So we put $610 million back into that continuing resolution to wipe out those cuts, because we think it's more important to save people's lives from cancer and Parkinson's and heart disease than it is to wear a green eye shade that says ''Mr. Perfect'' on it.

Then we added additional funding for community health care. 1.2 million additional Americans are going to be able to access community health centers and get health care without begging.

□ 1400

I do not apologize for that. Nobody does on this side of the aisle. When it comes to this bill, we make no apology of the fact that we are trying to restore funds which were cut out of this Interior budget for the last 3 years, cut out of the EPA budget, for the clean water revolving fund. There isn't a bigger need in rural America than clean water and decent sewer systems.

I represent all kinds of communities of less than 2,000 people. At least half of the families are headed either by women or people over 65. They do not have the tax-paying capacity on the property tax to meet the standards required of them to clean up their water and their sewer problems. Mr. DICKS has tried to deal with that. We do not apologize for that one iota.

We've got some other priorities too. We're going to try to provide additional funding for energy. We have added, in the three bills that have passed this House so far, and including this bill, we will have added more than $1 billion in an effort to increase and strengthen our energy research so that we aren't the prisoners of gas and oil companies and so that we aren't the prisoners of Middle East oil. We make no apologies for that.

Admittedly, there are some people in this House who know the cost of everything and the value of nothing. I'm looking at a few of them right now.

But the fact is that we recognize that it is important to make long-term investments so that 10 years from now, we can have the kind of country we want it to be, rather than having the kind of country we don't want it to be.

I would suggest I will compare our priorities to yours any time. You can defend those $57 billion in tax cuts for millionaires until the cows come home. I would rather defend increased service at our national parks, increased educational opportunity, increased health care, increased clean water and clean air opportunities. I think the public will take those priorities any time.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I think this has been a healthy debate.

I appreciate my good friend from Colorado for yielding. I want to commend as well my friend from Washington, the subcommittee chairman, for the work that he has done and the ranking member for work that they have done. The subcommittee chairman said that there was nothing personal in his opposition to this amendment, and that's true. There is absolutely nothing personal here in this Chamber.

But this discussion is personal to the American taxpayer, and it's all about priorities. We have offered today a series of amendments. One amendment said we ought to spend exactly what we spent last year, tens of billions of dollars in this area of the government. The majority party declined to accept that amendment.

Then we offered an amendment that said instead of increasing spending by 9.5 percent, we ought to increase spending by 8.5 percent, and they said, no, they weren't interested in that.

So the gentlelady from Colorado says, well, if you can't save $1 out of every $100, how about 50 cents? How about 50 cents out of every $100?

What Congress is spending in this appropriations bill and in every appropriations bill, because of the increase in spending, is money that we don't have. It's money that the Congress doesn't have. This money represents the debt that Congress is burdening on future generations, our children, and our grandchildren. It is simply time, it's time for Washington to stop finding ways to spend more money.

I commend the gentlelady from Colorado for her amendment. I urge my colleagues to support her amendment by decreasing by one half of 1 percent the increase in this appropriations bill.

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

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, as I think about this amendment again, I have heard from the distinguished chairman, and I do applaud his work and the work of the ranking member on this appropriations bill, but I heard, I believe it was Representative Contee talk about a meat-ax approach to reducing spending.

I would just like to say again that this .5 percent is just a gentle shave. We need to look at the trajectory when we look at appropriations bills and see where they are going. We need to ask the American family, are you guaranteed a 4.5 percent increase in your income every year?

I think we need to think of that American family, particularly moms and dads with children that are trying to figure out how long they are going to have to work in the year before they reach tax freedom day. How many days do they have to work before they have earned enough money to pay the government to spend like this with increases every year?

I am hoping we can look out for the American taxpayer, we can look out for hard-working Americans and say we are going to exercise fiscal responsibility, and we are going to start out with a very small step, reducing spending in this Interior appropriations bill by .5 percent.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong opposition to the amendment. I urge a ''no'' vote.

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.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PETERSON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania the designee for Mr. DOOLITTLE?

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Yes.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania:

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

TITLE VI—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. The amounts otherwise provided in this Act are revised by reducing the amounts under the following headings ''BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT—MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES'' by $34,341,000, ''BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT—LAND ACQUISITION'' by $17,015,000, ''UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE—LAND ACQUISITION'' by $25,035,000, ''UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE—MULTINATIONAL SPECIES CONSERVATION FUNDS'' by $4,655,000, ''UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE—STATE AND TRIBAL WILDLIFE GRANTS'' by $17,508,000, ''NATIONAL PARK SERVICE—LAND ACQUISITION'' by $76,873,000, ''NATIONAL PARK SERVICE—CENTENNIAL CHALLENGE'' by $22,721,000, ''ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY—ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT'' by $37,660,000, ''NATIONAL PARK SERVICE—OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL'' by $6,328,000, ''FOREST SERVICE—FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH'' by $7,500,000, ''FOREST SERVICE—STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY'' by $13,476,000, ''FOREST SERVICE—NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM'' by $53,773,000, ''FOREST SERVICE—CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT AND MAINTENANCE'' by $25,000,000, ''FOREST SERVICE—LAND ACQUISITION'' by $28,782,000, ''NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS—GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION'' by $35,438,000, and ''NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES—GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION'' by $18,895,000, and $425,000,000 shall be available for payments during fiscal year 2008 under sections 102 and 103 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–393; 16 U.S.C. 500 note), as reauthorized by section 2201 of Public Law 110–28.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 26, 2007, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I rise to support the Secure Rural Schools Act. My district in Pennsylvania is affected by this and many districts in the west are affected by this Act.

Over the years, timber harvesting and other mineral resources harvesting provided a huge resource for local governments, and, specifically, schools.

When those who chose not to continue the wise management of our forest by allowing the mature trees to be harvested, America's most renewable resource, we had school districts and governments in tremendous financial crisis. Several years ago, Congress had the wisdom to pass the Secure Rural Schools Act that helped stabilize the ability to educate our young people and give them the chances of an adequate, good education, because these rural communities did not have the infrastructure, because most of the property and land and resources was owned by the Federal Government. This Act has helped in immense ways, and this chance, this amendment, will continue that funding.

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, the most critical crisis in rural America, where there are large tracts of public forest land, is to deal with this issue of funding for the Secure Rural Schools.

The funding did finally come this year, but it came too late, at least for my district, and I think for many. Our State law requires that if you are going to give layoff notices to teachers, they have to go out in the month of March. All the layoff notices already went out. Most of the teachers already left the schools to find other employment. The funding for this finally came through in late May, as I recall, in the supplemental, but by that time the damage had been done.

We have to find a solution. This amendment that Mr. PETERSON and I are offering is an approach. I know there is a point of order that has been reserved, but we have to have timely funding for our rural schools. If we put it in this bill, it doesn't actually increase the deficit as it would if it went as a new mandatory program, or if it went in the supplemental. By the way, this is important enough, I would certainly support either of those other approaches.

But the fact of the matter is, we need to assure timely funding so that we don't have the situation where the funding comes in, but it comes in too late in order to really matter for the schools and the students.

Plumas County, for example, one county in my district, issued layoff notices to 55 personnel earlier this year, and most of them are gone, even though the funding ultimately came through. So this is timely funding. It does it in a way that's least detrimental to the whole budget picture. I have worked, I have tried to work on every possible solution that I could think of. This is really a critical situation for all of rural America, where there are tracts of public forest land, and I really strongly hope that the Members will support us on this, help us to get a resolution to this crisis so that we can meet the needs of the people that we represent.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, with deep regret, I insist on my point of order.

I make a point of order against the amendment because it provides an appropriation for an unauthorized program, and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI. Clause 2 of rule XXI states in pertinent part, ''An appropriation may not be in order as an amendment for an expenditure not previously authorized by law.''

The amendment proposes to appropriate funds for the rural school program that has not been reauthorized. The amendment, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI, and I am sorry that I have to raise a point of order, but the payments for the Secure Rural Schools Act of 2000 are not authorized.

This is a reachback appropriation for an unauthorized program and, therefore, I am sorry I must insist on my point of order. I will also point out that it would be irresponsible to cut this budget bill by $425 million.

Public Law 110–28 did not reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools Act.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. TIAHRT. I appreciate the chairman and his accuracy on what he is reserving a point of order on.

However, I would like to point out that we have other issues pending that are also subject to a point of order. It seems arbitrary to me that we do not let the House work its will on Mr. DOOLITTLE's efforts, and yet we move forward on other areas which are under the same point of order, and we expect some comity.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I don't think the gentleman is addressing the point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear any Member on the point of order.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I think that this is an arbitrary reservation on a point of order, and because other similar issues are pending, that it should be withdrawn so that we can move on and let the House work its will.

Mr. DICKS. I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A point of order is pending. The gentleman may not strike the last word.

Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The proponent of an item of appropriation carries the burden of persuasion on the question whether it is supported by an authorization in law.

Having reviewed the amendment and entertained argument on the point of order, the Chair is unable to conclude that the item of appropriation contained in the amendment is authorized in law.

Under the precedents of July 12, 1995, as recorded in House Practice at page 145, and July 16, 1997, an amendment adding matter at the pending portion of the bill to effect an indirect increase in an unauthorized amount permitted to remain in a portion of the bill already passed in the reading is not ''merely perfecting'' for purposes of clause 2(a) of rule XXI.

The Chair is therefore constrained to sustain the point of order under clause 2(a) of rule XXI.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. I want to say how badly I feel about this because this Secure Rural Schools program is a very important program in the northwest, as well as in California. But I just could not allow this amendment to come for a vote because it would have cut $425 million out of this bill.

□ 1415

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, we have an issue pending which is going to come up, I think, rather quickly, from the gentleman from Oregon who is worried about the very same issue, and he's coming at it from a slightly different angle.

And, yes, the gentleman from California was having offsets for his cuts, but I see no ill will in allowing the House to work its will on Mr. DOOLITTLE's amendment, which affects Western States deeply. It's very similar to what the gentleman from Oregon is also trying to do, so why don't we just let both of them go, let the House work its will?

Mr. DICKS. I regret that I can't take that chance. If this amendment were enacted, it would have a devastating consequence on this bill. And it was subject to a point of order, and I had to insist on it. I regret that we have this controversy, but that's the reality of the situation we're in.

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

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

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

Mr. TIAHRT. I'd like to yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to express my deep disappointment that we're not able to move forward on the gentleman's amendment from California, and the peril that it may put the next amendment in.

If you want to talk about cuts in crisis, you come out to rural Oregon, rural Washington, rural Northern California, the areas that my friend and colleague from Washington knows all too well.

The largest county in my district had 15 or 16 libraries, all of which are now shuttered and closed because this Congress and the last failed to reauthorize the Secure County Roads and Schools legislation that the Congress before, in 2000, put into law.

The effect of all that, and the effect of this not going forward is those counties have a 1-year stay of execution because in the emergency supplemental there was legislation that funded them for one more year.

But as the good gentleman from Washington State knows, with the decline in the timber industry, the decline in harvest on Federal lands, these rural counties have been devastated. They have no tax base in some cases, or very little; 70, 80 percent of land mass is Federal lands. There's been a commitment for 100 years by this Congress to share revenues, and then those revenues went away. Law enforcement is going away. Basic services. You all would throw a fit if they went away in Washington, D.C. or any other urban area.

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

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. The point I'd like to make, this is an authorization problem. This isn't supposed to be handled on the appropriations bill. We had an agreement that we would help you do this for 1 year, but then you would go back to the Natural Resources Committee and find the mandatory spending to offset this. This is not an appropriations matter.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Reclaiming my time, I understand, and I appreciate what the gentleman has done to assist us in the past. My frustration is the one I have to share, because when I go home, people don't understand why we can keep funding all these other things and can't take care of sort of an organic funding issue that affects them deeply.

The first bill I cosponsored in this Congress with my colleague from Oregon, Mr. DEFAZIO, and many others was to reauthorize this program. I believe the first letter I sent was to the new chairman of the Resources Committee begging for a hearing to reauthorize this program.

The folks at home don't understand this process, and sometimes neither do I. But if we have to bring down the House to try and get help to people who deserve it, then that's what we'll have to do.

It's really unfortunate that we would abrogate this commitment to these people in rural areas and not allow us at least to move forward, and certainly with the next amendment, which merely fixes a technical correction, allows the Resource advisory committees to go forward, but spends no money.

Mr. TIAHRT. Reclaiming my time, I just want to point out to the chairman that we're now picking winners and losers, and it's an arbitrary decision. And if we allowed the House to work its will, I think the gentleman would be successful and his worries would be abated.

But right now we've gone into this selection process of who's going to win and who's going to lose. The gentleman from California loses, the other gentleman from Oregon wins. And I don't think that's right. I think we ought to have a consistent manner to move forward.

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

Mr. TIAHRT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. The only thing I would say here is that you can raise a point of

order against the gentleman from Oregon's amendment, but that is going to hurt the other gentleman from Oregon. I mean, this is a partial help as a place holder in this bill.

And the distinguished chairman and I were just talking about we put $425 million in the supplemental to take care of this problem. Now, you've got to go get this done in the authorization committee. And I'm not going to risk this bill, which we fought so hard to create, on a chance that we might pass this amendment and cut all this other spending that's important in the bill to my constituents.

Mr. TIAHRT. Well, reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I believe that we're being inconsistent here. And I would hope for some consistency in the way we administer these areas where we have a point of order that can be reserved or can't be reserved. I think you should let the House work its will.

And when we make some winners that are chosen on your side, and then we arbitrarily choose not to allow Republicans to have the same opportunity, I think it's unfair. I would like some consistency in all the appropriations bills and not just this one.

And here we have a very critical need that affects both Republicans and Democrats. It's a critical need in these areas. And as the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) can tell you, it's going to be a big problem for him as well. So I just want some consistency here and allow the gentleman from California to have the House work its will.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas' time has expired.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if somebody could call the Attending Physician's office. I'm getting a bad case of whiplash here just listening to these arguments that run in opposite directions.

I just heard the gentleman say a minute ago, and I must say, I'm sympathetic to his problem, but I just heard him say a minute ago that he's frustrated. Well, I'm frustrated too because, what I'd like to point out, as the President of the United States pointed out just a few weeks ago, is that the gentleman's knocking on the wrong door.

And with all due respect, when Mr. LEWIS was chairman of the Appropriations Committee last year, it wasn't his job to reauthorize this program. And as chairman of the committee this year, it isn't my job to reauthorize this program. You need to go to the authorizing committee.

We have gotten dozens of lectures through the last month from Members on your side of the aisle who fuss and fume about individual earmarks that they say are not ''authorized.''

Well, this is a case where we on the committee are saying the following: you came to us last year. You said you couldn't get the authorizing committee off its duff, and so you wanted some help to sustain this program until you could get them to reauthorize it. So even against the strong objection of the President of the United States, and the last time I looked, he was a Republican, even in the light of his objection, we put in over $400 million to create a bridge for you until you could get this problem resolved.

Now, I'm sorry that this has not been reauthorized. You need to take that up with another committee. All I can tell you is that we're taking time on this bill, on this amendment because you think somebody else, in some other committee, didn't do their job.

Well, you can't have it both ways, and neither can we. So I would simply ask the gentleman to please go to the right committee. And I'd be happy to send them a letter. The fact is you're taking up this committee's time, and we're getting squawks from Members on both sides of the aisle saying, ''Why are you appropriators taking so blessed much time.''

Well, with all due respect, it's not the appropriators trying to take the time. It's people who are not on the Appropriations Committee who are aiming at the wrong committee in their search of solution to a problem.

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

Mr. OBEY. I would be happy to yield to my tire-changing friend from Kansas.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, we have, I think, a real crisis in the rural areas, and I do not blame the Members for using every means available to them to try to solve the problems in their districts. And I know it's not your responsibility to do it, but we've come through for these folks in the past, and I would just ask consideration in the future.

Mr. OBEY. I understand. All I can say is, we did respond. We've just heard umpteen speakers on your side of the aisle kick the blazes out of us because they're saying we're spending too much money. And now you're telling us that you're unhappy because we're not spending enough money on this program, and we're not even authorized to spend it. I have a difficult time following that logic.

Mr. TIAHRT. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. Sure.

Mr. TIAHRT. I understand the difficulty in it, but it was off-set. And the chairman of the Interior Committee did not like the offsets, and that's why he pushed the point of order. But it's just a different priority. And I have to say that is a pretty high priority.

I yield back.

Mr. OBEY. I understand. And I'm more than willing to cooperate because, unlike some people in this Congress, I recognize this is all one country. And we've got an obligation to recognize different needs and different demands in different districts. I wish we had the same courtesy extended to us by certain other Members of the body.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. I thank the chairman, and I've commended him before for his work in our behalf in this very difficult problem we face in the rural areas. And you've been terrific to work with. You've been most generous, not only with your time, but with your assistance. And I supported you and that bill when it came before, in opposition to my own President, and would continue to do so, because I know who sent me here, and I know what they want. And you may have missed my earlier comments.

Mr. OBEY. No, I have been watching them on television.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. I'm sorry you've had to put up with me there. The point is, I've done everything I can to try and get the committee that I served on for 8 years to even hold a hearing to reauthorize this bill. When I was on that committee in 2005 and chaired the Forestry Subcommittee, we marked up a reauthorization in 2005 by March, and we passed it out of the committee by June.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman the designee of Mr. LEWIS?

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I do so to yield to those who would like to continue this conversation. I'm glad to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE).

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I very much appreciate that. I'd like to ask Chairman OBEY a question, if I may.

Mr. LEWIS of California. By way of me, certainly.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Actually, I want to ask you one too, so I'm glad you're both up here.

Mr. Chairman, you have worked with us and tried to help us, and I would agree with Mr. WALDEN on that.

You were kind enough to offer something a minute ago that I'd just like to, if I may, accept that offer. You said you would write a letter to the chairman of the authorizing, the respective authorizing committees, which I think are both Resources and Agriculture in this case.

Could we, and with our ranking member, could I invite both you gentlemen to maybe submit such a letter to the relevant authorizing committee chairmen? I think that would be a step in the right direction here.

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield, certainly.

Mr. OBEY. I will be happy to try to assist the gentleman in any way that makes clear that the authorizing committees need to act, because this is not a matter under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee. I've only been around here 38 years; and on occasions, believe it or not, I've seen an authorizing committee object when the Appropriations Committee invades its jurisdiction.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. And I appreciate that.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I continue to yield.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Thank you, sir. The problem we have had is, frankly, the authorizing committees, for whatever reason, have chosen not to act. And in that vacuum we've been faced with a crisis of what do we do with the teacher being laid off or in Oregon's case with people being let out of the county jails because they're lacking this funding. We've had to come up with some extraordinary ways to respond to it.

Mr. OBEY. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Certainly. Happy to yield.

Mr. OBEY. Let me simply say, I would not say that it's fair to characterize the authorizing committees as refusing to move. We have only been in charge of this Congress for the last 6 months, and there have been a few other basic priorities, including reauthorization of the basic farm bill that I'm sure have occupied the authorizers. I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I'll be happy to continue to yield, but I'd like to take some time as well.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I didn't mean to imply, Mr. Chairman, that this was just this Congress' authorizing committees. I'm reaching back in time to include the previous Congress as well.

□ 1430

It did pass out of the Resources Committee. And I think the bill passed out handily. But it never cleared the other committee.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I find this conversation to be very interesting, and I noted that there is a tendency not to accept authorizing language in this instance because of a very specific problem, and because the authorizing committee has not acted. I, frankly, think there are a number of circumstances, including the next amendment that is even more significantly an authorizing problem that probably ought to be stricken as well. But if we are going to be consistent here, let's be consistent. And, indeed, I would be more than willing to join my colleague in communicating with the authorizing chairman in connection with this. But perhaps the time to draw a line is now and say we are not going to authorize in this bill and then see how they respond to us.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

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

The amount otherwise provided in this Act for ''The Historic Preservation Fund'' is hereby decreased by $1,000,000 and increased by $1,000,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 26, 2007, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just a few minutes ago, the full committee Chair mentioned the value of this bill, and I salute the appropriators, the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee, for the valiant effort that they have made, whether it is about hazardous toxic cleanup; Superfund sites; national parks; historic preservation, where $102 million is appropriated, $30 million over the budget of the President, $30 million over the 2007 mark and $20 million above the President's request. This is a very good effort, and I want to thank Mr. TIAHRT and I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee and both the chairman and ranking member of the full committee.

The chairman of the subcommittee just a moment ago mentioned the words ''downward trend'' in the budget process as another amendment was being debated. I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues the downward trend of historic preservation around America.

My amendment is simple. It is to encourage through reprogramming the National Historic Preservation Fund and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to redouble their efforts to assist State and local governments and community groups in identifying and working to preserve nationally significant sites, structures, and artifacts, particularly those relating to communities founded by newly emancipated slaves such as Freedmen's Town in Houston, Texas, or Tulsa in Oklahoma or the work that was done to serve the pre-Civil War and post-Civil War mansions in Savannah, Georgia, or the meat packing area in New York. We have to be able to stand for preservation in the face of urban renewal, in the face of urban infrastructure that has to be done.

I am hoping the reprogramming of $1 million will help communities like Freedmen's Town, help the city of Houston to realize that we mean business and the acknowledgment of the importance of historic preservation. This is the historic Fourth Ward. These are the cobblestone streets that have been laid by the hands of slaves. And just a few days ago, we commemorated emancipation. These are the remaining churches where pastors have dedicated their congregations and their moneys and themselves to historic preservation. These are the streets that have been disrupted.

And what we are hoping by this amendment is that the present project of infrastructure work for clean water, which is crucially important, can be done by the work or the analysis of an engineer that says you can do this on a sidewalk and preserve these cobblestone bricks that were laid by hand by 34 freed slaves who were bricklayers at that time. We know that the repetition of disrupting these bricks will destroy them forever, and there is a community that desires to have this preserved. This amendment, which is a reprogramming, emphasizes the importance of this.

Let us not have a downward trend, if you will, of historic preservation. Many Members have come to the floor with issues of value around Interior and Environment. We want the environment to be safe, but we want the historic environment to be preserved for those who are a valuable part of the historical story of America.

So I would ask my colleagues to support this amendment. It is crucial to the Freedmen's Town community in Houston, but it is crucial to the Tulsa story in Oklahoma. It is crucial to the story of Chicago, crucial to Savannah, crucial to New York, and many other States where we have systematically ignored the historic preservation of our Nation. Who will tell our children the story? I am fighting in Houston. Others are fighting elsewhere. This amendment is to create the historical record, the legislative record, that we are committed to.

Let me thank the committee for its commitment. We know the fund is sizable, but this is an important step. And the funding that was given is an important affirmation of historic preservation, particularly when engineers recognize that you can construct infrastructure work and preserve the historic identity of this community.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak in support of my amendment to H.R. 2643, the Interior and Environment Appropriations Act of 2008, and to commend Chairman DICKS and Ranking Member TIAHRT for their leadership in shepherding this bill through the legislative process. Among other agencies, this legislation funds the U.S. Forest Service, the National Park System, and the Smithsonian Institution, which operates our national museums, including the National Zoo. Most Americans do not know that this bill also funds a very special agency, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and its adjunct, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple but it sends a very important message from the Congress of the United States. The purpose of

my amendment is to encourage the National Historic Preservation Fund and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to redouble their efforts to assist state and local governments and community groups in identifying and working to preserve nationally significant sites, structures, and artifacts, particularly those relating to communities founded by newly emancipated slaves, such as Freedmen's Town in Houston, Texas.

Mr. Chairman, just west of downtown Houston lies the Fourth Ward. It is the city's oldest Black community. But before it was the Fourth Ward, this community was known by its original name, Freedmen's Town, given by freed slaves who settled it shortly after receiving the news of their emancipation on Juneteenth.

Initially located where Allen Parkway Village now stands, Freedmen's Town was established immediately after the Civil War, when many farmers gave or sold their truck farms and property to freed slaves. Freedmen's Town prospered during the turn of the century.

Economic, community, and social development were at a peak until local government became threatened by the prosperity of this area and its residents. In the 1920s, Freedmen's Town was the ''Harlem of the Southwest.'' The area was filled with many restaurants, jazz spots, and night clubs. These establishments were frequently visited by Houston's white citizens as well. West Dallas was the community's main commercial strip.

As the years passed and with the coming of integration, many Freedmen's Town residents began to move toward Texas Southern University, in the Third Ward, and other areas of the city, such as Studewood, South Park, Riverside Terrace, Kashmere Gardens, and Acres Homes. And the size and population of Freedmen's Town began to shrink. Much of this was due to construction in the late 1930s against the wishes of Blacks here, which continued to sever the historical neighborhood, divided nearly at midpoint by the addition of the Gulf Freeway.

The struggle for justice by community residents and leadership is only one facet of Freedmen's Town's rich and colorful past, which is still home to many significant historical landmarks and features. Hand-laid brick streets, constructed by Rev. Jeremiah and his congregation over half a century ago, still run through the area. Houston's first cemetery, Founder's Cemetery at Valentine and West Dallas, contains the graves of military men who fought in the Civil War, as well as the historical remains of John and Augustus Allen, the founders of Houston.

Immediately adjacent to Founder's Cemetery stands the ''Hanging Tree'' where several Blacks were hanged. During World War I, Camp Logan, located just west of Freedmen's Town, was the site of the worst race war in the city's history—the ''Camp Logan War'' in August of 1917.

Behind Founder's Cemetery lies Congregation Beth Israel, the oldest Jewish cemetery in Houston, which is beautifully maintained to this day. Among other historical churches in the area, Antioch Missionary Baptist Church built in 1866 continues to be a major focal point of Freedmen's Town, though it has been relocated from its original site on ''Baptist Hill'' where the Music Hall and Coliseum now stand.

Reverend John Jack Yates, the first Black pastor of Antioch, was a dynamic and influential leader known for his deep commitment to the education of Black youngsters. He often used his personal finances to send Freedmen's Town children to school. Today, Jack Yates High School in the Third Ward stands in his honor.

Of the houses that Reverend Yates built, only the one he built for his brother remains at 1314 Andrews. Yates' historical homestead at 1318 Andrews, believed to be the oldest two-story home built by an African American owner, was moved to Sam Houston Park (ironically, a park commemorating a slave-owner), while the house at 1204 Wilson was demolished by the City of Houston in 1986. Further plans promoted under the name of ''Founders Park'' so threatened the historical preservation of Freedmen's Town that outraged residents and leadership organized opposition through the Freedmen's Town Neighborhood Association to defeat the plans of outside private interests. However, the constant encroachment on Freedmen's Town and Fourth Ward continues to date with the plans of the Houston Renaissance and private developers.

Although Freedmen's Town is a nationally registered historical site, and the largest intact freed slave settlement left in the entire Nation, its official designation protects only 40 of the 80 blocks or more of the remaining Freedmen's Town area.

To preserve what remains of Freedmen's Town will require the combined efforts of community groups working with local, State, and Federal Government to reach a consensus of projects worthy of preservation.

One such project for Freedmen's Town is the ''Bricks Street Project,'' which is intended to preserve the original brick pavers of Freedmen's Town along Andrews Street and Wilson Street. These streets have been found to contain brick pavers patterns which may be unique to the Freedmen's Town area, and are consistent with brick patterns seen on architectural features located in the Historic District. Oral histories indicate the possibility that portions of the iron rails which once carried a Freedmen's Town trolley car may still remain in situ in the rail track ways.

Three of these community groups include the Rutherford BH Yates Museum, Inc., which has played a leading part in promoting the Bricks Street Project; the Resident Council of Allen Parkway Village, which works to educate the public on issues of Federal housing and historical preservation laws; and the Freedmen's Town Association, founded for the purpose of assuring the active and effective participation of current residents in planning the preservation, restoration, and development of the area, especially in the area of business and private home ownership.

Mr. Chairman, hearts break when irreplaceable structures are destroyed or damaged beyond repair, instead of preserved and protected as they deserve. A plaque pointing out ''on this site a great building once stood'' simply cannot tell the story in whole or in full. Equally tragic is the loss of traditions: a way of living or crafting wood or farming, of celebrating holidays or worshiping or feasting on ''Juneteenth'' cuisine. The preservation and perpetuation of artifacts as well as traditions is important to telling the story of the people who settled a community. By protecting the buildings, landscape or special places and qualities that attract visitors, we preserve our history for future generations.

For all these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment and thank Chairman DICKS and Ranking Member TIAHRT for their courtesies, consideration, and very fine work in putting together this excellent legislation.

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I would say that on behalf of the majority, we would accept the gentlewoman's amendment and would be willing to work with her closely on it.

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I was just curious as to which line this amount was coming from and where it is going to because the amendment I have just says it decreases $1 million and it increases $1 million.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it goes right into the same appropriations, historic State offices, but it doesn't take any money out without putting it right back in.

Mr. TIAHRT. Okay. I have no problem with that.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is agreed to.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for accepting the amendment, and I look forward to working with committee and working with the chairman on this important historical statement and language as we move forward to conference.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield, the chairman and ranking member look forward to working with the gentlewoman on this very important issue.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. INSLEE

Mr. INSLEE. 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. INSLEE:

TITLE ____—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to issue any permit for, or otherwise approve or allow, importation of any polar bear or polar bear part under section 104(c)(5)(A) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1374(c)(5)(A)).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 26, 2007, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, behold the polar bear Ursus maritimus, one of the most magnificent creatures on earth, legendary in its strength and to date its survival.

But today its survival is at great risk. It deserves the protection of the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and it does not have it.

Today we seek to close the loophole that alone amongst marine mammals allows the importation of bear heads, bearskins, bear claws in opposition to the basic concept of the Marine Mammal Protection Act. And we do so because this animal certainly is at risk. It is at risk because where there is no ice, there are no polar bears. This creature is dependent on the ice, and the ice is disappearing. That is what has led the Bush administration's Secretary of Interior to propose to list it as a threatened species.

But it gets worse. If you look at what the future is going to bring this bear, by 2040 the recent studies indicate that there will be no meaningful sea ice in the Arctic ocean by 2040 upon which these bears depend for their survival.

Now, we have folks who do enjoy trophy hunting in the United States, and there is nothing wrong with hunting or any suggestion of that in this amendment. But the truth is this: At this moment of risk to these bears, polar bear cubs need their parents in their dens more than we need polar bearskins in our dens. And this will simply close that loophole to remove that lack of protection from these animals.

Now, these animals are not threatened just in the United States. The ongoing trophy hunt is going on in Canada, where the International Polar Bear Community has found that at least half of the specific populations of polar bears are at great risk for extinction. And we know that hunters can be a force for conservation. We know they help provide habitat for ducks with Ducks Unlimited.

But the fact of the matter is, is that with a bullet to a bear, you cannot conserve it. And the fact of the matter is that the $750 permits that go to this bear hunt cannot solve the problem of global warming. And we stand here today to say that we ought to have the same level of American national commitment to the polar bears' continued survival as we have had for the bald eagle. And if we demonstrate that commitment, our grandchildren will enjoy these polar bears. And if we do not, they will not.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO).

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Inslee amendment.

This amendment would restore a ban on taking polar bear parts and importing them into the United States, a ban that was in place for 22 years. As Mr. INSLEE indicated, it was right around the end of last year when the Secretary of Interior and U.S. Fish and Wildlife service surprised many of us by proposing to list the polar bears as threatened under the Endangered Species Act. They have now taken public comments and must issue a final decision by December, 2008. At the very least, stemming the tide of polar bear imports, imports, I stress, until this decision is made makes sense.

Those who oppose the amendment would like to use the argument that this is all about restricting the right to hunt. It is not. If it were, I would not be standing here in support of it. I remember fondly, with my dad, my cousins, my uncles, hunting as a young man, and I don't believe this restricts the right of hunting.

So I would ask my colleagues to think seriously about the importance of this amendment and to give it their utmost consideration and strong support.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) for a brief question.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, the simple question I have is the picture of the polar bear that is down there, that is not, by any chance, new, is it?

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, this is an old polar bear species that has been around here for centuries, and the ice is melting under its feet.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for offering this amendment.

It is illegal to hunt polar bears in America today except for subsistence. You cannot do trophy hunting of polar bears today. So what happened is you have wealthy American hunters that go to Canada. They pay $30,000 to kill a polar bear for one reason, and that reason is to cut its head off, send it back to America, and put it above their fireplace.

There are only 20,000 to 25,000 polar bears left in America. This amendment simply prohibits funds from being used to permit these wealthy hunters from sending polar bear parts back to the U.S.

We should protect polar bears. This amendment is the right approach to take.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Under the current law, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service permits, under very stringent rules, the importation of bear parts for trophies. But this is only allowed from an approved management area in Canada.

□ 1445

Importation from other countries is prohibited because they are covered by the CITES, or Convention on International Trade and Endangered Species.

Also allowed under current law, other exemptions are permitted, but limited to Native American purposes, for medicines, for religious reasons and for certain scientific purposes. All of these require a permit from the Fish and Wildlife Service. And as far as the committee knows, the Fish and Wildlife Service is doing a very good job.

I also have a letter from the Canadian embassy. The Canadian Government is opposed to banning the polar bear trophy imports. Canada has strong opposition to this amendment, where two-thirds of the world's polar bear population exists. Now they're studying this through their endangered species group. We are studying this, as far as America is concerned, under our Endangered Species Act. And these two reviews are just about to be done. So this amendment is actually premature. And knowing that these two studies are pending, the Canadian Government has decided to oppose this. So I think this is premature. It should probably wait until next year, or they should just wait until the governments of the United States and Canada come to a conclusion.

Also, I want to note for the record that there are groups that are opposed to this amendment. These groups, besides the Canadian Government, include the U.S. Sportsmen's Alliance, the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, the National Rifle Association, Boone & Crockett Club, Congressional Sportsmen Foundation, the Conservation Force, the North American Bear Foundation and the Wildlife Management Institute, among others.

So I think it is very important that we allow top scientists in both the United States Geological Survey and the Fish and Wildlife Service do their polar bear population studies and see what problems exist before we start to limit what's going on under the current situation. So I think it's premature.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Kansas for yielding.

I have listened to the opening of this debate, and I think sometimes we get a little bit confused about what it is about. But there is plenty of evidence out here and plenty of support out here that the polar bear population is not threatened. There is a healthy population of 25,000 worldwide, I think. And contrary to the gentleman's remarks

about it being in America, it's globally, that population; and that it has been carefully studied, and that the permits that are issued generate funds for Native North Americans as well as funds to help sustain the polar bear population.

I think what this debate is about, and I can't question, certainly, anybody motives, but I can tell you what I got here. I got an announcement that said: ''This recorded vote will be scored on the 2007 Humane Society scorecard.''

So I look at the information that I see, and much of it is source from that Web page, which I happened to have printed as well.

But I think the debate is a broader debate than the debate of the welfare of the polar bear. I think this debate is about, and I am going to broaden this, ''the incremental implementation of global vegetarianism.'' That's the big picture. And the second picture is, ban sport hunting. And the third picture is, ban livestock production and feeding. And the fourth picture is, ban the consumption of meat. All that stuff fits within this big umbrella. This is one component of the much broader picture.

But if you take it back down to the issue that was raised, and another one is using the canard of global warming being the issue, well, it actually works against you, gentlemen. If you're worried about global warming and if you're worried about the habitat for polar bears being diminished by global warming, then humane hunting would be the thing to do as the habitat diminishes to make sure they had a healthy habitat for them to roam on. That's not the case. It's a canard, not a reason. And it's not an environmental reason. It's a broader agenda, through which the environmental and global warming agenda fits.

So this is sound science that holds this up on this side. And sports hunting is a good way to manage population.

I would urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 1 minute remaining, and the gentleman from Washington has 15 seconds.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. I want to thank my friend from Washington for yielding me this time. And, unfortunately, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I have had numerous conversations with Mr. INSLEE, who I consider one of my closest friends and colleagues in the House, and I certainly understand the appreciation that he has in light of the challenges we face with global warming and the potential impact it's going to have on polar bears. But as one of the cochairs of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus in the House, we think this amendment is unnecessary and, in fact, counterproductive.

I contacted the Canadian embassy and the Canadian Government, who opposes the amendment. They say it would risk crucial conservation funding streams and habitat protections for the very polar bears that we're all interested in protecting. Also, our own U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service opposes this, again because of the cooperative alliance that we've established not only with Canadian officials in the proper wildlife management of this special species, but the fees collected from hunting that go right back into a conservation program that the U.S. and Russia have partnered with in order to enhance the protection and the growth of this population.

Now, I've got a letter from the Canadian Government, as well as from the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, that I will submit for the RECORD that states forth more fully the science behind their calculation and the limited number of permits that they're allowing in Canada.

ASSOCIATION OF FISH
& WILDLIFE AGENCIES,
Washington, DC, June 22, 2007.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: The Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies strongly opposes H.R. 2327, the so-called ''Polar Bear Protection Act'', both as a stand-alone bill and as an amendment to any other legislation. This bill, which would ban the importation of trophies of polar bears legally taken from polar bear populations in Canada, will further complicate polar bear management and not contribute to polar bear sustainability.

The Association was founded in 1902 as an inter-governmental organization of public agencies charged with the protection and management of North America's fish and wildlife resources. The Association's members include the fish and wildlife agencies of the states, provinces, as well as federal government agencies in the United States and Canada. The Association provides a forum for hundreds of senior level fish and wildlife public agency biologists across North America to develop positions on public policy issues involving wildlife conservation. The Association has been instrumental in promoting sound resource management and strengthening federal, state, and private cooperation in protecting and managing fish and wildlife and their habitats in the public interest.

This legislation would diminish the bear's value to the local communities which depend on hunts by United States hunters for income. We know from long experience that most successful wildlife conservation programs have, at their core, value to local people and communities. We are advised by our Canadian colleagues that many native communities earnestly engage Canada's polar bear management programs because these animals have value—funding schools, community centers, etc. in those northern communities. This legislation, if passed and enacted, would just add to the list of other factors already complicating polar bear management—melting ice pack, warming seas and loss of snow cover.

The Marine Mammal Protection Act prerequisite that imports come from certified stocks is an important tool for those biologists working with these local communities to regulate the harvest of the various polar bear populations. These carefully set and intensely monitored harvests are critical for the local community and are an important negotiating tool for the biologists. Science-informed regulated hunting ensures sustainability of polar bear populations.

Passage of this bill would not result in the taking of fewer polar bears; it will just complicate the work of those trying to conserve them. We urge that you not favorably consider H.R. 2327 either as a stand-alone bill or as an amendment to other legislation. Thank you for your sincere consideration of our perspectives.

Sincerely,

MATT HOGAN,
Executive Director.

CANADIAN EMBASSY,
Washington, DC, June 25, 2007.

Hon. JAY INSLEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. FRANK A. LOBIONDO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES INSLEE AND LOBIONDO: I am writing regarding your amendment to ban the importation of polar bear trophies from Canada, which I understand may be offered to the Department of the Interior, Environment and Related Agencies Appropriations Act 2008, when the spending bill is considered on the floor of the House this week. I would like to express Canada's strong opposition to such an amendment for the reasons outlined below.

Canada is home to two thirds of the world's polar bear population. There is broad consensus among scientists that climate warming is negatively impacting Arctic sea ice, however, these impacts occur at different rates and times in different Arctic regions. The Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada, an independent scientific body, is currently assessing the status of polar bears and will submit its conclusions to the Government of Canada in 2008. Based on that assessment, consideration will be given whether to list polar bears under the federal Species at Risk Act.

I understand that the United States is also reviewing the status of polar bears under the U.S. Endangered Species Act (ESA). Canada has made a submission in the U.S. review and is working with other polar bear range nations on issues related to polar bear research and management. Any action, such as that proposed in the amendment is premature and should at least await the outcome of the two reviews.

I would also like to take this opportunity to clarify that the annual harvesting of polar bears in Canada is strictly regulated within scientifically determined sustainable levels. Northern Communities receiving a share of the annual quota allocate their share between subsistence hunting and sports hunting, Removal of the sports hunting exemption from the Marine Mammal Protection Act will have no impact on the numbers harvested but will cause economic hardship to Canadian Northern indigenous communities. Finally. I would point out that the export of polar bears from Canada is governed by the provisions of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), of which Canada and the United States are both signatories.

The Government of Canada takes seriously its international obligations with respcct to the conservation of polar bears and their habitat, including under the International

Agreement on the Conservation of Polar Bears which was signed by all five polar bear nations, including Canada and the United States.

The Embassy staff remains available to meet with your staff to discuss these issues further.

Yours sincerely,

MICHAEL WILSON,
Ambassador.

But this would also, I believe, not reduce the number of polar bears harvested. There is a certain number, again based on scientific studies in Canada, that go to native tribes in northern Canada for their management and use. If it's not hunters using it, the natives will use it. So this will not in any way diminish the number of polar bears being legally hunted right now in Canada.

I would ask my colleagues, take a look at the ''Dear Colleagues'' that we've submitted as part of the Sportsmen's Caucus setting forth more fully an explanation of why we oppose the amendment. And I would encourage our colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair will notify Members that debate on a pro forma amendment is not controlled.

Mr. DICKS. Okay. So I just yield?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. DICKS. Can you let me know when 1 minute is gone?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair will let the gentleman know.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Inslee amendment. This amendment would ban the importation of trophies taken legally from healthy polar bear populations in Canada.

Removing incentives for U.S. hunters to hunt polar bear in Canada would do nothing to reduce the number of polar bear harvested in Canada. It would just lessen the resources that can be used for conservation and management of these species.

Similar to all wildlife conservation funding, U.S. hunters support polar bear conservation through fees that they pay. Permit fees directly support polar bear research and conservation in the United States and Russia.

Mr. Chairman, this management practice that has occurred in places like Canada has contributed to the rebound of the population of the polar bear for numbers somewhere around 6,000 to 20,000 today. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would do nothing for conservation of polar bears. It is simply one step further in the campaign to ban hunting.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I now will yield my remaining time to Mr. INSLEE, and I rise in strong support of his amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to Mr. FERGUSON.

Mr. FERGUSON. I want to thank my friend from Washington and my friend from New Jersey, and others, for supporting this amendment.

I also rise in strong support of this amendment today. We can see here a picture of a beautiful polar bear. Recently, the polar bear was listed as threatened under our Endangered Species Act. I don't believe that allowing hunters to obtain permits to hunt these animals and bring them into our country is a responsible environmental policy, with the loss of habitat that these animals are enduring. And with a 30 percent population decline predicted in the next 35 to 50 years, we ought to be doing everything in our power to preserve this species, and this amendment seeks to do just that.

It is our responsibility to create responsible environmental policies to protect our planet for future generations, and I think this amendment does exactly that.

Mr. INSLEE. I would like to address this canard that this is an anti-hunting amendment.

In fact, Americans enjoy passing down the tradition of hunting to their kids, their sons and daughters; and that tradition should be able to continue. But if the prey is gone, there is no hunting. And if we don't get serious about recovering polar bears, we will not be able to hunt anything because they will not exist. And if we don't stop this loophole which allows importing polar bear heads, contrary to the Marine Mammal Protection Act, we cannot tell our children we are serious about recovering this species.

Listen to the science. In 40 years will there will be no polar ice cap. And shooting polar bears and putting them in our dens in Texas or any other great State in this country is not consistent with what we did for the American bald eagle. And if we work together, hunters, nonhunters, left and right, east and west, we can accomplish this goal. But I'm suggesting this is a commonsense measure to close this loophole and listen to the science.

These species are going to have a 30 percent decline in the next 30 years. Three of the six Canadian groups that are already hunted are deemed at risk by the international scientific community.

I don't know what the Canadians are thinking. It's a great country; they're the greatest ice hockey teams in the world. But maybe they haven't got the best polar bear policy like we do in the good old USA.

Enforce the Marine Mammal Protection Act. Bring some common sense. Tell our kids we're going to keep these species available to them and pass this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind the gentleman from Washington that he has 15 seconds remaining in his previous time which he may wish to reserve to close.

Mr. INSLEE. I will reserve to close.

Mr. TIAHRT. I just want to remind the gentleman from Washington, it's not a loophole, it's the law today.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Let me just say I appreciate the gentleman representing this picture of a polar bear. It's not Knut. Knut, of course, is the infamous polar bear cub the animal rights groups who support this amendment wanted the Berlin Zoo to kill as opposed to allow it to live in captivity. I'm glad it's not the same one.

This amendment does nothing to preserve polar bears. It's not about preservation, especially when it cuts conservation funds in the process.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I am thankful for the comments of the previous speaker, and of course the ranking member. I'm disappointed in those that are offering this amendment.

The supporters of this amendment and the proposer of this amendment like to believe that Chicken Little threats have been thrown about. Instead of the sky falling, it's the Earth warming, and bears are in extreme danger of extinction and we must act now. I just heard that speaker from Washington say that.

Let's take care. Polar bears are not threatened; they're not endangered. The worldwide population of polar bears is around 30,000. While there may be polar bear populations feeling the effects of a warming climate, and I say ''may,'' we need to remember these species have survived past warming cycles.

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

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. This species is not at the end of its rope, contrary to those who proposed this amendment. Thirteen of the 19 polar bear populations are under the jurisdiction of Canada. Canada has one of the best management programs, using state-of-art scientific practices to manage these populations. While that should be enough, it's not the end of the oversight or management of polar bears in Canada.

The United States Marine Mammal Protection Act requires the Fish and Wildlife Service to review the status of polar bear populations in Canada. After conducting their review of the service-approved, stable and healthy populations, hunters can only import trophies from those approved populations.

Supporters of the amendment like to refer to the 1994 amendments of the Marine Protection Act that allowed an importation of polar bear trophies as a loophole. It was the law. These statements are far from the truth. In fact, we worked on it with a Democrat-controlled Congress. We worked on it together to improve the species in Canada because Canada asked us to do so.

In 1970, many marine mammal populations faced numerous threats. The Marine Protection Act was very effective in restoring many marine mammal populations to healthy or historic levels. Unfortunately, the act does not discriminate between healthy marine mammal populations and those still in need of rebuilding. Robust populations of marine mammals are treated like they are on the verge of extinction.

While the 1994 amendments did not address this issue, the Democrat-controlled Congress, specifically those enlightened members of the Merchant Marines Fisheries Committee, had the foresight to understand that the sustainable use of resources and conservation activities are not mutually exclusive. The committee developed strict requirements to ensure the protection of polar bear populations in Canada, while allowing for the importation of sport-hunted polar bear trophies.

The idea of incentives to give value to natural resources was very new at the time. A similar program was developed for African communities to protect big game resources in Africa using the same incentive structure. These programs have proven their worth and are very successful.

There will always be a sector of the population that believes we should not kill anything or eat anything and, in fact, we should eat grass. However, we need to keep in mind there are still areas in the world that rely on the natural resources around them and still subsist on these resources.

The argument is not that polar bears need to be protected due to the effects of a warming climate. The argument is that certain groups do not like hunting, regardless of what those are saying promoted, and want it stopped.

The Canadian polar bear populations are healthy and well managed. Sport-hunting activities provide important incentives and support remote Native villages and important conservation programs in Canada, the U.S., and Russia.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest, respectfully, go back to the history. This saves the polar bear as is in place. This amendment will extinguish the polar bear.

For those who don't know anything about the polar bear, and I suggest, respectfully, those two gentlemen that introduced this have never seen a polar bear in the wild, don't know anything about it, read it in a book.

□ 1500

I suggest respectfully that before this was in place, in 1994, what was happening was that the Canadian natives, bless their hearts, would hunt polar bears. They would kill the sows and the cubs but not the boars. The boars would kill the cubs so they can breed the sows. Our polar bear population was going down. Because of our actions, in fact, the polar bear population increased. That is what we were trying to do. It was a true conservation method, a method of science, a method that works.

Mr. Speaker, if this amendment is adopted, you can forget your polar bears in the wild. They will be extinguished. This is a bad amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding.

Just to reiterate, Mr. Chairman, numerous agencies that have looked at the science of polar bear management in Canada and other places feel that the limited permits that are issued for this hunting purpose is conducive to conservation efforts and habitat protection up in Canada, especially through the indigenous tribes there that are issued these permits every year.

The Canadian letter that I just referenced earlier stated, ''Removal of the sports hunting exemption from the Marine Mammal Protection Act would have no impact,'' no impact, ''on the numbers harvested, but would cause economic hardship to the Canadian northern indigenous communities.''

Again quoting from the letter from Canada, ''Any action such as that proposed in the amendment is premature and should at least await the outcome of the two reviews.'' The two reviews they are referring to is our own Fish and Wildlife review and also a Canadian review in regards to the status of polar bear populations, those reports are going to be coming due some time early next year.

Also, the National Wildlife Federation, I want to clarify, the National Wildlife Federation has not endorsed nor opposed Mr. INSLEE's amendment, but they stated in a letter submitted to Members of Congress yesterday, ''We understand that there may be a debate about managing polar bear populations, which we believe is a distraction from the real issue of global warming.'' They go on to state that the only thing that could adequately protect the polar bear population is prompt action taken on global warming.

Mr. Speaker, I would agree with the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) on the importance of that issue.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 15 seconds.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to submit that the day we yield to Canadian judgment, we would replace baseball with ice hockey. It is not the American principle. We have a strong Marine Mammal Protection Act. It has a clear loophole. We do not want the last polar bears to be head and skins in dens. We want this species to continue. This will do that. Pass this amendment.

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

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

Mr. INSLEE. 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 Washington will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. UDALL OF COLORADO

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. UDALL of Colorado

Page 111, after line 17, insert the following:

TITLE VI—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to prepare or publish final regulations regarding a commercial leasing program for oil shale resources on public lands pursuant to section 369(d) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58) or to conduct an oil shale lease sale pursuant to subsection 369(e) of such Act.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SNYDER). Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 26, 2007, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would bar the Interior Department's Bureau of Land Management from issuing any final regulations for commercial-scale leasing of oil shale and from offering any commercial oil shale leases during fiscal year 2008.

Current law requires BLM to issue those regulations, and to move to a full-scale commercial leasing program, on a crash basis and under a tight deadline.

I think that is a mistake, so I want to make it clear I support Chairman RAHALL's bill, H.R. 2337, that would change that and other parts of the 2005 Energy Act. The Natural Resources Committee has favorably reported the chairman's bill and it is headed toward this very floor.

The purpose of this amendment is to slow the administration down in the meantime, in order to give Congress time to complete action on that legislation.

Mr. Chairman, oil shale has great potential as an energy source, and therefore it is an important part of our energy policy. But it is also important to American taxpayers, because they own most of it. But it is particularly important for Colorado.

Our State has some of the most large-scale deposits of oil shale, and Coloradans, particularly those on our Western Slope, will be directly affected by its development.

Back in 2005, the RAND Corporation reported that the potential benefits of developing oil shale were significant. But they also made it clear that development will affect not only our land

but our air and the quality and quantity of our very limited supplies of water. It was noted that large oil shale development will bring significant population growth and is likely to put stress on the ability of local communities to provide the needed services.

In short, the report reminded us how much Colorado and our neighbors had at stake when Congress debated the oil shale provisions of the 2005 Energy Policy Act.

As I said, that law now calls for a crash program. I have been concerned, as many people have in Colorado, that that would bring a rush to commercial development before the Interior Department knows enough to do it right and before Colorado's communities have had a chance to prepare for what it will bring.

My concerns grew this year, when a witness from RAND told our committee that the economic, technical and environmental feasibility of oil shale development is not adequate to support the formulation of a commercial leasing program on the time scale mandated and the fundamental approach the Department of the Interior is currently taking may be counterproductive if the goal is to keep open the option for a sustainable domestic oil shale industry. Chairman RAHALL's bill would correct some of those problems.

I want to be clear, I strongly support oil shale provisions, because I think they will help assure that any commercial development is done in an orderly way that takes full advantage of the important research and development work underway.

The bill would also relax the unrealistic deadline for the BLM to finish the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement now underway, and then the bill would allow a year, not just 6 months more, for the BLM to prepare a draft, not a final, but a draft commercial leasing regulation, after which the people in Colorado and elsewhere would have 180 days to comment.

I also support the bill and its mandate for developing a strategy for sustainable and publicly acceptable large-scale development of oil shale in Colorado, Utah and Wyoming, and its continued requirement that we consult with the governors of those States.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the Natural Resources Committee on a bipartisan basis adopted my amendment to set aside part of the money that the Federal Government will get from oil shale leases to help affected counties pay for construction, operation and maintenance of public facilities and for the provision of public services. This addition reflects my concern about what large-scale oil shale development can mean for Colorado's Western Slope.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the full House will follow our committee's lead and approve these changes in the current law. I certainly will do all I can to help Chairman RAHALL be successful in this effort. But there is a risk that these efforts could be frustrated unless Congress first acts to relieve the pressure current law puts on the BLM to move ahead on a crash basis.

Mr. Chairman, that is the purpose of the amendment, and I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I want to tell the gentleman that I think he has got a good amendment here. Our side is prepared to accept your amendment.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I thank the chairman for his support.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I hate to have to disagree with my colleague from Colorado on this issue, but I definitely do so. Oil shale resources in the United States, as was just stated, are tremendous. The potential is that there could be 2 trillion, not billion, 2 trillion barrels of oil in place in the oil shale bands of Colorado, Utah and Wyoming. It is, therefore, a strategically important domestic resource that should be developed on an accelerated basis to reduce our growing dependence on politically and economically unstable sources of foreign oil imports.

The Department of Interior has issued the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement and is now working on regulations for a commercial leasing program. Stopping them now in their tracks would be a waste of taxpayer dollars. I should point out, Mr. Chairman, that the research and development of this important resource have been paid for by the private sector at no cost to the taxpayer.

The Udall amendment is unnecessary, because oil shale provisions in the Energy Policy Act of 2005 require approval of the governor before commercial leasing can go forward. So it is not yet entirely even in place. Therefore, this amendment would delay development of this important domestic resource.

If we commercialize oil shale, that would provide significant public benefits, including increased fuels available, reduced risk of supply disruption, reduced imports, improved balance of payments, new Federal and State royalty and tax revenues, increased domestic employment and increased economic growth. Tremendous benefits will come from this.

Further, oil from shale will place appreciable downward pressure on the world prices of crude oil, which would improve America's, and, indeed, the entire world's economies.

□ 1515

Oil shale is highly concentrated and gives the greatest yield of oil per acre disturbed of any of the Nation's energy resources. The oil shale resources of the Nation, besides totaling 2 trillion barrels, would yield 750 billion barrels with a richness of 25 gallons per ton or greater with near-term adaptations of existing technology. It is possible that an oil shale industry could be initiated by 2011, with an aggressive goal of 2 million barrels a day by 2020, which would create 100,000 new jobs directly and indirectly, and ultimately the capacity could reach 10 million barrels a day, which is comparable to the oil sands up in Canada.

So apart from the energy independence problems that this amendment would cause, that production of oil shale is close to starting, and, therefore, it is not right to pull the rug out from under the private sector companies that have been working on and investing in this resource.

In summary, there is no proven need to delay the use of this exciting new source of domestic energy. The environmental concerns have been addressed in a responsible and careful way. Billions of gallons of oil will make our country freer from foreign pressure and our economy stronger, with more energy available, gasoline prices lower at the pump, and more jobs for our working families.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, the first chart that will eventually come up here, and I am sorry about this, indicates the States in the United States that have the hardest time increasing their education funding. This is where the funding is growing the slowest.

You notice the common denominator with these is not an attitude towards education, it is that most of these are land-based States. The land has been taken away from us to develop a property tax base. Fortunately, God has given us resources underneath that to compensate for that. But any program that would retard the leases or the royalties that will come from those will harm education in Western States.

My kids in Utah will be put at a disadvantage because of this particular amendment. There is collateral damage that takes place with amendments, and one of those deals with education.

If you can look at this chart in the proper way, this chart shows the salaries that are given for first-year teachers in Wyoming versus the salaries on average for fourth-year teachers in Montana. Now, this should not be that way, because Montana has the fewest amount of public lands of any of the Western States. They have more of a property tax base. The difference is Wyoming has the resources that they have developed, which allows them simply to put more money into their education system.

My colleagues who are still teachers deserve a decent salary, they deserve a decent retirement, we deserve the right to build our public schools. When you ask anything that shackles them from a brighter future, either by postponing or forcing to replow the data that the professional land managers have already established, it harms them.

You have taken away our land for property tax benefits. Allow us to develop the resources so that we can have

a future for education in the Western States that is on par with those in the Eastern States. It is important that we move forward. And I'm sorry, but there is collateral damage with this amendment that harms educators and education in the West.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON).

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, my friend and colleague from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) has mentioned that there are 2 trillion barrels of oil. That is a conservative estimate. Estimates go way, way, way beyond that. The only way we are going to know how much oil there is is if we actually have the opportunity to unleash the creativity of the American genius to go after that oil and develop it.

Mr. LAMBORN also said that we expect to have a large production by 2011, 4 or 5 years from now. The fact is, we could have big production out of shale much sooner than that if we continue on the path that we are on. If we delay, we will not have that opportunity.

I have an amendment that I am going to offer in a few minutes, and I will continue to talk about this point.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, the question here is not whether to develop oil shale, but how and when. The amendment would not stop it in its tracks, as my good friend from Colorado suggests, but it would direct those tracks on to a gentler and a more sustainable route.

We have always heard, Mr. Chairman, about oil shale being the fuel of the future. But as the Rand Report mentioned, I remind us, so are the potential problems. My amendment says, as we work to realize this promise, we are not closing our eyes to the problems in front of us.

I urge adoption of this amendment. It is a smart amendment. It is a wise amendment. It keeps faith with the people of western Colorado.

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

Mr. Chairman, I believe strongly in a balanced energy policy. We need to invest in alternative energy sources and we need to tap the resources that we have in a responsible manner.

The Department of the Interior is now completing a programmatic environmental impact study on the commercial leasing program that is authorized under the Energy Policy Act of 2005. This study is focused on evaluating the potential impacts associated with the development of commercial leasing programs for oil shale and tar sand resources on public lands in Colorado, Utah and Wyoming.

The scope of this environmental impact study will include an assessment for the positive and negative environmental, social and economic impacts of leasing oil shale and tar sand resources, both the positive and the negative impacts. I think that is important.

This will also include a discussion of the relevant mitigation measures to address any potential impacts on the Bureau of Land Management's administered lands in Colorado, as well as in Utah and Wyoming. The Bureau of Land Management anticipates that the draft Oil Shale and Tar Sands Leasing Programmatic Environmental Impact Study will be issued just this summer. But this amendment would stop that from occurring.

The draft environmental impact study will be followed by an extensive public comment period, and a second revised programmatic environmental impact study will be issued prior to the final record of decision.

I believe we must pursue environmentally responsible means of developing domestic energy sources, and this amendment delays the responsible planning process already in place.

The gentleman from Colorado said this is important to our energy policy, and I agree. He also said that this was important to our taxpayers. I also agree. But the leases that were expected to come in under the Energy Act of 2005 have been taken into consideration in the budget we already passed this year. By stopping this, you will stop the income from those leases in fiscal year 2008. So this will cause us to exceed the budget authority.

I would suggest the gentleman from Colorado withdraw this amendment because it is subject to a point of order because your budget authority is going to be exceeded by this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would yield to the gentleman from Colorado, but I would request that he withdraw this amendment.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to my great friend from the Midwest, I will not withdraw the amendment. I would make a point there, I don't believe a point of order is in order, because there is no revenue anticipated from the leases that are anticipated.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr Chairman, reclaiming my time to explain the reason the revenue would be depleted, there was planned income from fiscal year 2008 from the leases on the oil shale. So I believe, in my estimation, I am waiting for confirmation from the Congressional Budget Office, that it will be out of order.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, and I thank you again for yielding, I am very certain that that is not the case, and I would just again remind all of my colleagues that the intent here is to do this right. Not to stop this from happening, but to do it right, given our history of oil shale development or the lack thereof in western Colorado.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman. I would say it is important that we let this process continue, and therefore I think we should vote down the Udall amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Kansas is referring to the other Udall amendment, not this amendment. I don't think there is a point of order here. There is another Udall amendment that did have an issue with it. There are a lot of them, so I can see how he could get confused.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I thank the chairman for trying to continue to hold the ranking Member in accuracy, but I believe it applies to both Udall amendments.

Mr. DICKS. Well, we will wait and see. But I didn't note the gentleman making the point of order.

Mr. TIAHRT. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I understand that I have missed my window of opportunity at this point in time to raise a point of order, but I will reserve that opportunity in the future, if such an opportunity will present itself.

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

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

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

Mr. CANNON. 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 Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. UDALL OF COLORADO

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. 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. 3 offered by Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

Page 111, after line 17, insert the following:

TITLE VI—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement Bureau of Land Management regulations on Recordable Disclaimers of Interest in Land (subpart 1864 of part 1860 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations) with respect to a claimed Revised Statue (R.S.) 2477 right-of-way or to issue a non-binding determination pursuant to the Secretary of the Interior's Memorandum to Assistant Secretaries dated March 22, 2006, revoking the Department of the Interior's previous Interim Departmental Policy on Revised Statute 2477 Grant of Right-of-Way for Public Highways.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 26, 2007, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in a moment I am going to ask to withdraw the amendment, but I want to engage Chairman DICKS in a brief colloquy. But first let me provide a little bit of background here.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the amendment deals with claims under an 1866 law known as R.S. 2477 that granted rights-of-way to build highways over Federal lands. This act was repealed in 1976, but because Congress did not set a deadline for people claiming these rights-of-way to come forward, we still do not know what valid rights-of-way may exist.

There are pending claims that affect military lands and lands once owned by the Federal Government that are now private property. Other claims involve national parks, national forests and other conservation areas.

When the Clinton administration tried to resolve this problem administratively, Congress blocked that by passing a law barring issuance of final regulations on this subject until Congress authorized them. That law is still on the books. The Bush administration has not asked Congress to change the law. Instead, they want to do an end run around Congress and to deal with these claims through an administrative process.

My amendment would have blocked them from doing that because I think we should deal with that problem through new legislation. Toward that end, I have worked for a number of years with counties in my State and introduced a bill based on the results of that work.

My goal has been and still remains to establish a fair and neutral process that will result in setting a time certain for claims to be brought forward so valid claims can be recognized and any invalid ones will be resolved and so to bring an end to litigation and controversy. I do plan to continue to work on that approach in this Congress.

If I might, at this time, I would turn to the chairman and ask him, does the chairman agree with me that it would be better for the administration to work with Congress to resolve this issue, rather than trying to follow a course that will lead straight to more litigation?

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, yes, I agree. In our report on this bill, the Appropriations Committee warns the Interior Department that we are concerned about the Department's interpretation and actions that would disclaim Federal interests in lands subject to an R.S. 2477 claim or issue any nonbinding determination that would have a similar effect. That is why we tell them to provide advanced notice to the Congress if the Interior Department plans to approve any R.S. 2477 claims. We also require them to provide quarterly reports on activities concerning claims under the R.S. 2477 statute. But it would be even better for the administration to work with the gentleman and the Natural Resources Committee to develop a legislative solution for this serious problem, and I urge them to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr Chairman, reclaiming my time, I want to thank Chairman DICKS for his thoughts.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to impose on the time of the House by calling for a vote on the amendment today, although the problem has not gone away and it will not go away unless Congress acts.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be withdrawn.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. DE FAZIO

Mr. DEFAZIO. 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. DEFAZIO:

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

TITLE VI—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. In implementing the amendments made by section 5401(c) of the U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007 (Public Law 110–28), a resource advisory committee established under section 205 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 500 note; Public Law 106–393), in addition to the duties assigned to the committee by subsection (b) of such section, shall—

(1) monitor projects submitted by that committee that have been approved by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture;

(2) advise the designated Federal official on the progress of monitoring efforts under paragraph (1); and

(3) make recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture regarding any changes or adjustments to the projects being monitored by the committee.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

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

Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 26, 2007, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

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

Mr. Chairman, I realize that the other side is reserving a point of order on this because of a previous objection to an amendment which would have allocated $425 million into the Safe and Secure Rural Schools program, a program which I very much support. I am on the authorizing committee and I can assure them that the authorizing committee is determined to move forward on, one of the authorizing committees at least, in the near future. In the last Congress, the Resources Committee did act and the Agriculture Committee did not on reauthorizing this program.

So we are engaging in that process in good faith and hope to be working with our friends on the Appropriations Committee in the not-too-distant future to extend this program for a number of years as we phase it down.

But in the interim, the Appropriations Committee and this Congress did, in the emergency supplemental, approve 1 year of temporary funding, which was excellent. It staved off disasters in county after county in terms of closed jails, loss of rural sheriffs patrols and many, many other vital services.

But, unfortunately, in doing that there was an oversight, and it is a simple oversight, easily rectified if there is not an objection. One of the most beneficial parts for the Federal taxpayers generally beyond the services that are provided within the counties and school districts across America is the Resource Advisory Committees, committees made up of a broad cross-section of communities across the Western United States, both environmental, timber interests, general community members, who have come forward, worked collaboratively, and have put 15 percent of the funds under the program, reinvested it back into the Federal lands, providing tremendous benefits ecologically to those lands, economically, in terms of thinning projects and other things, things that were not within the budget of the United States Forest Service or the Department of the Interior in the case of the O&C lands.

Unfortunately, since these committees, which are widely applauded in a bipartisan way across the Western United States, were not reauthorized, this language simply would give them authorization to monitor the ongoing activities.

It is extraordinarily noncontroversial, and it would be extraordinarily regrettable if in some sort of a misplaced tit for tat there was an objection to this bipartisan amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague Mr. DEFAZIO for his work on this amendment with me.

I would like to point out that on page 182 of the committee report there is listed 30 different laws that have not been reauthorized and are being funded. Some of these laws were last reauthorized 28 years ago. So the fact that we have something before you that has just gone out of operation here in less than a year, and we are trying to do a technical correction here to reauthorize it, I don't think is deserving of a point of order.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I am prepared to accept the gentleman's amendment. I think this is a very positive amendment. It has nothing to do with what we were discussing earlier, and I am prepared to accept your amendment.

□ 1530

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Well, I'm not sure everyone is, so if I may continue. There are over 4,500 projects that these resource advisory committees have worked on. They have leveraged $292 million to improve watersheds and wildlife habitats, and reduce the risk of catastrophic fire. No resource advisory committee has been disbanded or melted down. There are 70 of them in 13 States. No RAC-approved project has been appealed or litigated. No other active land management initiative in either the Departments of Agriculture or Interior can equal such a track record.

This has brought disparate individuals together to do good things for the land, habitat and watersheds in a comprehensive way that leverages local funds and support.

Today, as we debate this issue on the floor of this House, fires are raging at Lake Tahoe, destroying homes and habitats and watershed. Those sorts of efforts, where they tried to get in and thin in this watershed and protect it and reduce the threat of fire, might have been allowed to occur had there been a resource advisory committee like these, and I don't know what they have got there, but certainly they were not able to get the job done before the fire hit.

We are trying to do good things for our national forests, and I know others are trying to as well. I just hope we can approve this.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my remaining minute.

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

Mr. Chairman, there are few Members of Congress who have more open territory than I do in my district. There is enough space there to put four eastern States easily and have room left over. I have rural schools and problems that very much reflect the concerns that have been expressed here.

But at the same time, I must say to the chairman and to the House, I was sitting in my office observing the discussion early when the Doolittle amendment was up. I was about to come to the floor because the chairman of the full committee was beginning a discussion regarding who taxes too much or too little, and who spends too much and too little, and we will have that conversation as we go forward. But that is what caused me to want to come to the floor.

In the meantime, Mr. DOOLITTLE had a very specific problem that was going to be taken care of, and it was objected to because it was legislating on an appropriations bill. Because of that, I am going to be pretty tough on this. The reason I reserved in this case, even though it affects my own district, it is my intention to ask that the amendment be stricken.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. DICKS. The only thing I would say here is that this amendment is much different than the Doolittle amendment. This would help the gentleman from Oregon and Mr. DOOLITTLE in having a placeholder in the bill.

As the gentleman knows, we agreed to $425 million in the supplemental to help these gentlemen on the rural schools. My concern here is that this is not an appropriations problem, this is supposed to be an authorization problem. I even helped them way back in 1992 or 1993 when the timber harvest went way down—Congresswoman Dunn and I got the first program through Congress to keep this going for 10 years.

I have been a friend of this rural schools program. I don't quite understand why this very small amendment that doesn't have any negative impact on anyone would be stricken.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, if I could.

I understand the point that the chairman is making, and I am very appreciative of it.

The bill, as you know, was slushed with an awful lot of money above and beyond what we anticipated. Before we got the last $3 billion we had a fine bill. It strikes me that as we were slushing, we might have put some money in this category if we were so concerned about it.

But in the meantime, there is little doubt that because of the need for consistency here, if we are going to be striking language in the fashion that I saw as I was sitting in my office, selectively, then it seems to me we ought to try to at least raise the flag of consistency, and it is my intention to do that here.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LEWIS of California. At your will, Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: ''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

The amendment in this case imparts direction, so I insist upon my point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to speak on the point of order?

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, to the point of order, again, the gentleman is technically correct. But again, unlike the previous amendment, this amendment not only does not cost money, it actually benefits the Federal Government and the Federal taxpayers.

I wish the gentleman would reconsider that point and not target this because of an earlier debate on a different issue having to do with spending levels. This actually would save the taxpayers money. I would ask that the gentleman reconsider his objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Seeing no further speakers on the point of order, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language imparting direction. The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

Mr. LAMBORN. 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. LAMBORN:

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

None of the funds in this Act may be used for the National Endowment for the Arts.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 26, 2007, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that recognizes the difficult fiscal situation facing our government.

The Interior Appropriations bill has the largest increase over the President's request of any of the spending bills, and I will support efforts to bring the costs down as these opportunities arise. At a time when our budget needs balancing, we must reprioritize our spending. That is why the amendment I am proposing now would eliminate funding for the National Endowment for the Arts.

I am disappointed that my earlier amendment yesterday was not accepted as it would have directed some of the funding toward the PLT program, or payment in lieu of taxes by the Federal Government to compensate for lost revenues to local governments.

But I still maintain that particularly in this budget environment, taxpayers should not be asked to fund the National Endowment for the Arts. Now opposition to the NEA should not be perceived as opposition to the arts. My wife is an artist, and I support the arts wholeheartedly. But I do feel strongly that it is something that the private sector can fully, and has in the past fully and wholeheartedly supported.

True art can and does survive without Federal handouts. Artists have every right to be creative without forcing the taxpayer to fund it. The private sector is the appropriate venue to fund such projects. I know artists who refuse to take money from any level of government because they want to be

independent. They don't want to have any strings attached. They don't want to be beholden to anybody, and they will refuse government funding.

While there are certainly projects that the NEA does that are worthwhile, some are objectionable and have been over recent history. And at a time when fiscal restraint is crucial, we must examine closely how and where we are spending taxpayer money. It is not only appropriate but necessary to question some of the funding in this bill and see if it can be either reduced or directed to more worthwhile programs.

My amendment would save taxpayers an immediate $150 million in budget authority spending in fiscal year 2008, and allows the remaining $10 million to be spent on shutdown costs. This still reduces the overall cost of this spending bill and sends a message that in this budget environment we are willing to tighten our belts here in Washington just as any American family or business would have to.

It is disheartening to think there is an assumption of continued taxpayer support for every single discretionary program. Yet that is exactly what we are hearing today in this debate on funding for the NEA. There are arguments for why we must continue to spend money on an art program when we face budget constraints in trying to adequately provide necessary treatment for our returning veterans and all of the many priorities in our almost $3 trillion budget.

I come from a commonsense perceptive that says when my bank account is low, I make tough decisions on where my money must be spent. None of my colleagues supporting this funding seem to fully appreciate this approach, and it is disappointing and it is in large part why we face the budget situation that we are in.

I would note that the budget for this appropriations bill is I believe $1.9 billion over what the President has requested. I hear talk about how our deficit is going up every week, every day, every month. This is a great opportunity that we have to stop the hemorrhaging. We can stop the spending. I am disappointed that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are contemplating not extending the Bush temporary tax cuts. They want to end that in their budget plan. That would amount to the largest tax increase in American history. We have this opportunity now to take $160 million and save it for the taxpayer. So I just think this would be a well-considered thing.

The arts are valuable in American life and culture. For anyone to say let's do this through the private sector as opposed to the taxpayers does not make them a member of the Flat Earth Society. The arts are valuable, but they are well supported in our society and culture. We just have so many other priorities.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. We have heard speaker after speaker on the Republican side say how concerned they are about spending. The minority whip stood in the well and castigated the Democrats for spending. He has $950,000 of earmarks in the bill.

The woman from Colorado has $150,000 of earmarks in the bill.

If the gentleman is so sincere, let's entertain a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. Chairman, is it in order to make a unanimous-consent request?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It depends on the nature of the request.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Republicans be allowed to voluntarily strip their $45 million of earmarks from this bill, which would save one-quarter of the amount of money that the gentleman is trying to save by cutting all the funding for the National Endowment for the Arts.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The order of the House allowing only certain amendments may not be varied by the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DEFAZIO. In conclusion then, we have a bit of hypocrisy here. They want to complain at the same time as they put the projects in their pocket and they go home and brag about it. They brag about how they want to cut spending in Washington, and they brag about the money they bring home.

I believe in investment in America in many ways, and this bill is making many crucial investments in America.

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

It is important for Members to realize as they consider the committee action that the $160 million recommended only partially restores cuts made to this agency a decade ago. In fact, the amount in this bill is still $16 million below the level provided in 1993. After adjusting for inflation, the amount recommended is $100 million below the level in 1993, as displayed on a chart that I showed Members earlier.

As we debate this amendment, Members should also note that the National Endowment for the Arts has been transformed since the arts funding debate of the 1990s. Two gifted chairmen have reinvigorated the NEA into an agency with broad support. Chairman Bill Ivey, appointed by Bill Clinton, negotiated and implemented bipartisan reforms in NEA's grant structure to ensure that funds go to activities for which public funding is appropriate.

Dana Gioia, the current chairman, then energized the agency with many new programs and a commitment to reach beyond the cultural centers of our major cities.

Last year, every single congressional district received NEA support through innovative programs such as the American Masterpieces, Operation Homecoming and the Big Read.

Today, NEA is a truly national program with outreach efforts to every corner of America and every segment of her society. Each of us have different reasons to support the arts. Some will describe their support in terms of the inherent joy of the arts as a personally enriching experience. Others support the arts as engines of job development and economic growth.

□ 1545

It is equally important to emphasize that most Members of the House in recent years have been supporting funding for the arts and for the humanities. I believe the cultural wars should be over. For each of the last 7 years with the help of many Members in this Chamber, a bipartisan majority in the House has voted to increase funding for the NEA. During the last 2 years, Ms. SLAUGHTER's and my amendments to add funds were adopted by voice vote, without opposition from Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. Chairman, I do not normally include quotes in my floor remarks, but I was struck in preparing for this year's art debate by a quote attributed to actor Richard Dreyfus at the Grammy awards ceremony:

''Perhaps we've all misunderstood the reason we learn music and all the arts in the first place. It is that for hundreds of years, it has been known that teaching the arts helps to create the well-rounded mind that western civilization, and America, have been grounded on. America's greatest achievements in science, in business, in popular culture, would simply not be attainable without an education that encourages achievement in all fields. It is from that creativity and imagination that the solutions to our political and social problems will come. We need that well-rounded mind now. Without it, we simply make more difficult the problems we face.''

I believe Mr. Dreyfus is right, and the committee has acted to provide the funding so arts can reach even more broadly into American communities with a richer variety of programs.

I urge defeat of the gentleman's amendment and support for the committee position.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for his remaining 30 seconds.

Mr. LAMBORN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My wife, Jeanie, is an artist. I support, she supports, the arts. I agree with what you said about the importance of arts in our culture. The only question is who should pay for it. Should the taxpayer pay for it or the private sector? The $160 million budget in this bill is $35 million, or 29 percent, higher than last year's budget. Do we need a 29 percent tax increase? I think the arts are great, but let's support it in the private sector.

I would urge adoption of this amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for his remaining 30 seconds.

Mr. DICKS. I just will wrap this up.

I would say, you know, it's very unusual to say you support a program or support the arts when you offer an amendment to eliminate the entire program. It's like saying I'm for the B–2 bomber but I want to vote against it. You can't have it both ways. Either you're for the arts or you're not. When you're here, you have to demonstrate that support by supporting the program.

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

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

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

Mr. LAMBORN. 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 Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CANNON

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON:

At end of bill add:

SEC. _____. None of the funds in this Act may be used to implement section of this bill (relating to oil-shale leasing) in the States of Utah or Wyoming.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

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

Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 26, 2007, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would limit the effects of the amendment by my colleagues from Colorado to Colorado.

I am deeply troubled by my colleagues' zeal to stop oil shale leasing and development in the West. Oil shale is not a new idea. In fact, the lands in question were once part of a strategic reserve. Rather than limiting our energy resources, I am offering this amendment in an attempt to make sure that Americans have the opportunity to be energy independent and to create more American jobs.

Utah, Colorado, and Wyoming hold a conservative estimate of 2 trillion barrels of recoverable oil in the Green River Formation. We have one or two times the total crude oil reserves of the whole world and triple the amount of oil reserves in Saudi Arabia. Two trillion barrels of oil is enough to meet current U.S. demands for hundreds of years.

At a time when the price of consumer goods and services are soaring in large part because of the cost of energy resources, why would we intentionally hinder our ability to develop our most promising resource? It is no secret that the environmental community does not want shale development to succeed in this Nation, but we have environmental laws that are designed to protect our Federal lands. If those laws are not sufficient, let's talk about those issues as opposed to simply putting up roadblocks to this promising resource. Increased global demands, skyrocketing energy prices, geopolitical instability, concerns about peak oil production and supplies are all economic factors that we believe make oil shale an attractive natural resource to help solve our country's dependency problems.

The U.S. and world demand for oil is increasing, and we will not be able to conserve our way out of this dilemma. We must as a country look to other sources of energy. Many experts agree that oil shale in Utah can be a major part of the solution. Issues regarding environmental and community impact will need to be addressed at a local, State and Federal level and also by private industry. I believe Utah and the region can look to Canada's oil sands to see what other countries have done to develop their resources and the benefits that come with such development. Canada has invested vastly in oil sands and has seen a huge return in royalties. Oil sands are now a $20 billion-per-year industry in a remote area of Canada.

We cannot leave our constituents holding the bag on higher energy prices. Development of oil shale as well as oil, gas and renewable energy technologies will lighten the load of our constituents. Successful development of oil shale can help solve the Nation's energy dilemma and also bring millions and eventually billions of dollars to the Federal Treasury, Utah, Colorado, and Wyoming through royalties and mineral lease moneys.

We have heard that we need to be energy independent. How, then, can we criticize the BLM for moving forward in helping us achieve this goal? We should be encouraging the responsible development of oil shale so that we can in part fulfill our desire to keep from relying on foreign and often unstable nations for our energy resources. These are nations that hate us and who use our American dollars to hurt our interests.

I would encourage my colleagues to support the amendment and resist the urge to destroy the potential of oil shale before it is developed. I would encourage my colleagues to support my amendment to allow States that want to develop oil shale, that they be allowed to develop that oil shale.

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

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

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

Mr. DICKS. This amendment is a mistake. There are plenty of reasons to delay the oil shale leasing which the BLM is doing. The Governor of Colorado and several other local Members of Congress have also asked for an appropriate delay so the public can fully understand the ramifications of massive oil shale leasing. Furthermore, the large-scale demonstration projects have begun and it is far too soon for large-scale commercial leasing.

To give the companies time to learn from the demonstrations, I think we should defeat this amendment and stay with the Udall amendment. What this does is basically overturn the Udall amendment, which is pending at this time.

I urge opposition to the Cannon amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington withdraw his point of order?

Mr. DICKS. I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. CANNON. I thank the gentleman for withdrawing his point of order and would point out, I understand that the Governor of Colorado, a Democrat, has decided that he doesn't want oil shale development in Colorado and my Democratic colleagues have opposed oil shale development in Colorado. It is true that in Colorado there are major projects that are underway and that have begun with some small-scale demonstration projects. That is fine for Colorado. It does not make sense for America to impose on Utah and Wyoming the same concerns that the Democratic leadership of Colorado wants to have in Colorado. And so I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment. The fact is I think, having looked at the industry, the likelihood of significant oil shale development, oil coming out of shale, is more likely to be from entrepreneurial sources that are not dependent upon these vast, vast projects that are being done in Colorado.

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

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Do you want us to all vote for the Udall amendment so that your amendment can repeal it?

Mr. CANNON. No, no. If the Udall amendment passes, then my amendment would become irrelevant. But I think under the rules of the body today, we were not able to do a second-degree amendment which is what I would have preferred. That being the case, the fact is Colorado has expressed itself I think pretty clearly here today that they don't want this development and, in fact, the case is different in Colorado than it is in Utah. I think that the opportunity for entrepreneurial development of oil shale should not be inhibited by frivolous government regulations. We have laws in place. In Utah,

we are not going to do things that don't make sense environmentally.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

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

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

Mr. TIAHRT. For purposes of discussion, I would like to ask the gentleman from Utah if it is correct, and my understanding of what you're trying to do is offset what Mr. UDALL is doing because he is stopping the permitting process not only in Colorado but also in Utah, your home State.

Is it also true he would stop the permitting in Wyoming as well?

Mr. CANNON. That is true. This would delay the development of oil shale. The Udall amendment would delay it in Colorado, Utah and Wyoming. My amendment would limit that effect to just Colorado and allow Wyoming and Utah to develop their shale as they wish.

Mr. TIAHRT. So, Mr. Chairman, as I understand this, what the gentleman from Utah is doing is his very best to represent the interests of his State. And what the gentleman from Colorado is doing was try to represent the best interests of his State. So I think in fairness to the Members of Colorado, Utah and Wyoming, it would be proper for us to adopt Mr. CANNON's amendment. That way it would satisfy Mr. UDALL by restricting and limiting the permitting process in Colorado but allowing the gentleman from Utah to represent his district by letting the permitting process move forward.

So I would encourage the Members of the House to support Mr. UDALL via Mr. CANNON's amendment and vote to accept the Cannon 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 Utah (Mr. CANNON).

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

Mr. CANNON. 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 Utah will be postponed.

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 Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

Amendment No. 51 by Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

An amendment by Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona on Greene County, Pennsylvania.

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona on Columbus, Ohio.

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona on Greensburg, Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 22 by Mr. JORDAN of Ohio.

Amendment No. 29 by Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

Amendment No. 27 by Mrs. MUSGRAVE of Colorado.

Amendment No. 17 by Mr. INSLEE of Washington.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

An amendment by Mr. LAMBORN of Colorado.

An amendment by Mr. CANNON of Utah.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. GINNY BROWN-WAITE OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) 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 Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida:

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

TITLE VI—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES—NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS—GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION'' is reduced by $32,000,000.

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 137, noes 285, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 564]

AYES—137

Akin
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackburn
Boehner
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Latham
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Renzi
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shuster
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Souder
Stearns
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Upton
Walberg
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—285

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bono
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)

Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Bishop (UT)
Braley (IA)
Costa
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Giffords
Johnson (GA)
Jones (OH)
Meek (FL)
Olver
Ortiz
Pearce
Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

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

□ 1621

Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. LUCAS and Mr. MOLLOHAN changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 564, I was at the White House. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 51 offered by Mr. CAMPBELL of California:

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

None of the funds in this Act may be used for Wetzel County Courthouse, New Martinsville, West Virginia.

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 104, noes 323, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 565]

AYES—104

Akin
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Bono
Brady (TX)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Chabot
Coble
Conaway
Cooper
Cubin
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, M.
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Feeney
Flake
Fortenberry
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves
Hastert
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McHenry
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Smith (NE)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Upton
Walberg
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)

NOES—323

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonner
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
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
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortuño
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
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
Lucas
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
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
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Blackburn
Boehner
Braley (IA)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Giffords
Jones (OH)
Meek (FL)
Ortiz
Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that there is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 1626

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 565, I was at the White House. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAMPBELL of California:

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

None of the funds in this Act may be used for the Conte Anadromous Fish Laboratory.

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 97, noes 330, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 566]

AYES—97

Akin
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bono
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Chabot
Coble
Conaway
Cooper
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Ehlers
Feeney
Flake
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Goodlatte
Graves
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lofgren, Zoe
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McHenry
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Thornberry
Upton
Walberg
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)

NOES—330

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Capito
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
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
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)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Brady (TX)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Hirono
Jones (OH)
Levin
McDermott
Moore (WI)
Ortiz
Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that there is 1 minute remaining on the vote.

□ 1630

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 566, I was on the floor, but in a discussion with collegues, and missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOURNING THE PASSING OF THE HONORABLE JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to announce to the body that a former Member of this body, John J. Flynt, Jr., better known as Jack Flynt, of Georgia, passed on Sunday at his home in Griffin, Georgia.

Congressman Jack Flynt was 92 years old. He served in the Congress from 1954 until his retirement in 1979, and he was a member of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, and at one time, he was also the Chair of the Ethics Committee.

Congressman Flynt had many varied professional experiences. He was a prosecutor and the founder of a bank. During World War II, he joined the Army Reserve and was aide-de-camp to Brigadier General Robert W. Grow in France. For his service he was awarded the Bronze Star.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield to my colleague from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague for yielding.

Congressman Jack Flynt was a lifelong resident of Spalding County in my district. After gaining a bachelor's degree at the University of Georgia and a law degree at George Washington University, a young Jack Flynt enlisted in the Army Reserves. He fought the war in France, won a Bronze Star, and retired as a colonel in the Reserves.

After serving his Nation at war and in the Congress, Congressman Flynt came home to Griffin for the last 20 years of his life and he continued working in his hometown community.

On behalf of the people of my district, the Third District of Georgia, and the great State of Georgia, I thank Congressman Flynt for his lifetime of service, and our thoughts and prayers are with his wife and family.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield now to my colleague from Georgia, Congressman PHIL GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague Mr. LEWIS for yielding.

Former Member Jack Flynt served in this body for 24 years. It has been mentioned that he served on the Appropriations Committee. Some could say that he is neither a Democrat nor a Republican but an appropriator. But Jack Flynt was a boll weevil Democrat. If he were here today, he would be a staunch member of the Blue Dogs, I feel confident.

When I was running in this district originally, that area was in my district and many people said to me, You need to know Jack Flynt. I am disappointed, Mr. Chairman, that I never did get to know him. But in every instance the word about Jack Flynt was he was a gentleman.

And he and his wife of 65 years, Patricia of Griffin, Georgia, they have three children: Susan Flynt Stirn of Arlington County; John J. Flynt III of Augusta, Georgia, my hometown; and Crisp B. Flynt of Griffin; four grandchildren and two great grandchildren.

I am humbled to have an opportunity to just say a few words about a great Member of this body and to pay respect to him and offer our condolences to his entire family.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the House now join in a moment of silence in memory of John J. Flynt.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Members will rise and the House will observe a moment of silence.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) on Greene County, Pennsylvania, 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 104, noes 328, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 567]

AYES—104

Akin
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Bono
Brady (TX)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Conaway
Cooper
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Feeney
Flake
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McHenry
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Upton
Walberg
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)

NOES—328

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonner
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortuño
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
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)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
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
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Jones (OH)
Ortiz
Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1639

Mr. BUYER changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) on Columbus, Ohio, 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 66, noes 364, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 568]

AYES—66

Akin
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Biggert
Bilbray
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Conaway
Cooper
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Ehlers
Feeney
Flake
Fortenberry
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Graves
Heller
Hensarling
Inglis (SC)
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
Mica
Miller (FL)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Petri
Pitts
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Smith (NE)
Souder
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Walberg
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)

NOES—364

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson

Filner
Forbes
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Kagen
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)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Jones (OH)
Kirk
Ortiz
Pence
Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1643

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) on Greensburg, Pennsylvania, 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 86, noes 343, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 569]

AYES—86

Akin
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Blackburn
Blunt
Bono
Burgess
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Conaway
Cooper
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Ehlers
Feeney
Flake
Fortenberry
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Gohmert
Graves
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McHenry
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Ramstad
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Stearns
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Upton
Walberg
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)

NOES—343

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortuño
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
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)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
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
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
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)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Hunter
Jones (OH)
Nunes
Ortiz
Sessions
Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 1647

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 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 150, noes 281, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 570]

AYES—150

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cubin
Culberson
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Lamborn
Lewis (CA)
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
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)

NOES—281

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Calvert
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
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
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
Jindal
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 (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)
Peterson (PA)
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
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
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Hunter
Ortiz
Pickering
Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining on the vote.

□ 1651

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 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. There are five 2-minute votes after this vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 254, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 571]

AYES—178

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ellsworth
Emerson
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
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
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rehberg
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—254

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow

Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
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
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
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
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)
Peterson (PA)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
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
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—5

Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Marchant
Ortiz
Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There are less than 30 seconds remaining on the vote.

□ 1654

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 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 is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 238, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 572]

AYES—193

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carney
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Patrick
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rehberg
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Upton
Walberg
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—238

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carson
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
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
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
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
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
Walden (OR)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Nunes
Ortiz
Pascrell
Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining on the vote.

□ 1658

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. INSLEE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) 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.

There are three more 2-minute votes continuing after this vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 242, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 573]

AYES—188

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baird
Baldwin
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bono
Boucher
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Campbell (CA)
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doggett
Doyle
Ehlers
Ellison
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Frelinghuysen
Giffords
Gillmor
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Olver
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Platts
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reichert
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Solis
Stark
Sutton
Tauscher
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—242

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carney
Carter
Chandler
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (AL)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Dingell
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Keller
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Pascrell
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—7

Burgess
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Herger
Norton
Ortiz
Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining on the vote.

□ 1702

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. UDALL OF COLORADO

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 215, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 574]

AYES—219

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bordallo
Boyd (FL)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gordon
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reichert
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
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tauscher

Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—215

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyda (KS)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kanjorski
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Space
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—4

Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Ortiz
Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1709

Messrs. SNYDER, RANGEL, BOYD of Florida, LEVIN and BACA changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, rule XX, clause 2(a) says that no vote will be held open to change the outcome.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman states a fair question. The vote was kept open to do the numerical calculation to see if the votes of the Delegates would change the outcome.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I understand that you hold the vote open for people not having voted, but this was a specific case of people changing their vote after the limit.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The vote was not kept open for the purpose of allowing Members to vote. There had to be numerical calculations on the votes of the Delegates to see if they changed the outcome of the vote. That was the purpose of the delay. It was not for any other reason.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, if I understand it correctly, the rule XX, clause 2(a) was put into effect to keep votes open and keep people from lobbying to change their votes. That is exactly what happened on this vote, and it is against the rules.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) 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 97, noes 335, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 575]

AYES—97

Akin
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Brady (TX)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis, David
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Everett
Feeney
Flake
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hunter
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Lamborn
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCaul (TX)
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Musgrave
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Radanovich
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shuster
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor
Thornberry
Walberg
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)

NOES—335

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Drake
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
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
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell

Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Abercrombie
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Ortiz
Sessions

□ 1715

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CANNON

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) 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 204, noes 223, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 576]

AYES—204

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boucher
Boustany
Boyda (KS)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Cramer
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Space
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—223

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bordallo
Boswell
Boyd (FL)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gohmert
Gordon
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hill
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
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
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reichert
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
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Conyers
Crenshaw
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Hinchey
Hoekstra
Ortiz
Reyes
Sessions
Whitfield

□ 1719

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2008''.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY) having assumed the chair, Mr. SNYDER, 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. 2643) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under House Resolution 514, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Udall amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment:

Page 111, after line 17, insert the following:

TITLE VI—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to prepare or publish final regulations regarding a commercial leasing program for oil shale resources on public lands pursuant to section 369(d) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58) or to conduct an oil shale lease sale pursuant to subsection 369(e) of such Act.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 210, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 577]

YEAS—216

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boyd (FL)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reichert
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
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—210

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyda (KS)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Space
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Ortiz
Sessions
Smith (NJ)
Waxman

□ 1741

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

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Interior Appropriations bill, and in favor of the rational funding increases it proposes to help manage federal lands, support Native Americans, protect our environment, and address the urgent problem of global climate change.

Chairman DICKS and his staff have put together a great bill that finally reverses the long series of cuts for environmental programs imposed by the President and previous Republican Congress.

With $2.047 billion in this bill, we can finally take a step forward to address the huge backlog of maintenance projects in our national parks system.

With $8.086 billion in this bill we can finally put some teeth into the Environmental Protection Agency's mission as it now moves to comply with the recent landmark Supreme Court decision requiring regulation of greenhouse gas emissions under the Clean Air Act.

With $5.731 billion in this bill we can finally make good on some of the promises we have made to Native American communities by supporting health care, education, economic development and law enforcement, including a targeted methamphetamine prevention initiative.

And with the important creation of a new Commission on Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation with a $50 million budget to jumpstart scientific activity, we can begin to implement some real solutions to the problem of global climate change.

I am also pleased that in addition to making these much needed investments, the Interior bill maintains the bipartisan moratorium on new oil and gas drilling on our outer continental shelf.

We recognize that safeguarding the health and natural beauty of our coastal environment for future generations is an important priority for our nation.

We don't believe that it is worth trading away coastal habitats to the administration's cronies in the oil and gas industry to continue their massive shakedown of our constituents through tax incentives and high prices at the pump.

I again want to applaud my colleague Chairman DICKS for writing such a well-crafted, thoughtful, and forward looking bill and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2008.

This bill is the first step on the long road back to re-investing in our environment after years of neglect. It is a much-needed turnabout from the practice of treating the natural world merely as a source of material, rather than as the human race's one and only home. It is a necessary reversal of past policies which disregarded the value of clean water, clean air, and our public lands.

It represents the commitment of the new Democratic majority to strengthening the long-term viability of our environment. At the same time, it protects public health and demonstrates how important it is for us to act as stewards for our communities.

Treating our wastewater before it is discharged into our oceans and rivers is a crucial part of this process. However, the equipment and infrastructure that we use to clean our wastewater is rapidly aging. It no longer has the capacity to treat the amount of waste produced by our growing population. My constituents in Sacramento have battled this problem for years. When heavy rains come, the specter of sewers overflowing into our streets can become a harsh reality.

That is why I am so pleased that the Appropriations Committee has used this legislation to renew our commitment to clean water infrastructure. H.R. 2643 increases water-related research, restores funding for clean water grants to States, and directs greater resources to cleaning up contaminated groundwater sites. In doing so, this bill recognizes that investing in clean water protects our drinking supply, restores our rivers and lakes, and strengthens public health.

Mr. Chairman, Americans across the country—and in particular the people I represent from Sacramento—will benefit from this legislation's clean water provisions. No longer will we have to worry about untreated wastewater stagnating in our streets and polluting our rivers. No more will raw sewage seep into basements, public parks, and other areas where young children play.

When we pass this bill, the water our constituents drink will be cleaner. The rivers they swim in will house fewer bacteria. The sewers they rely on to transport wastewater will stop overflowing. Every Member of Congress has an interest in solving the problems of overwhelmed wastewater infrastructure, and H.R. 2643 begins to do so.

While this bill is but a beginning, Mr. Chairman, I am confident that the Democratic Congress will use it as a building block to continue restoring past cuts to clean water programs. The tangible benefits of this bill's clean water funding levels are considerable, but they are still just the first step in renewing our country's commitment to that basic building block of life that sustains us all.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2643.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my concerns about legislative amendments related to permitting drilling for oil or natural gas off of our Nation's Outer Continental Shelf (OSC).

I want it to be very clear what I support with regard to offshore drilling. I believe it is important to ensure that we can adequately protect Florida's shoreline and I believe that the legislation approved last year by the Congress more than protects Florida's shoreline. I support a 100-mile buffer of protection for our beaches when it comes to drilling oil wells. Additionally, I am not opposed to allowing natural gas only wells at a distance closer than 100 miles, particularly in those States that want to permit natural gas wells closer to their coasts.

The current Federal moratorium on offshore drilling bans natural gas wells not only along the Florida coast, but also along southern, central and northern California; Washington; Oregon; and the North Atlantic, including Virginia. The State of Virginia has indicated that it would like to permit drilling off of its shore. The Democrat Governor of the State has asked for the ability to allow drilling off of Virginia's shore. The Republican legislature of Virginia has asked the Federal Government to remove the barrier to drilling off the coast. The Federal moratorium in the Interior and Environment Appropriations bills stops this policy asked for by the State of Virginia.

Additionally, with regard to Florida, I would like to clarify some confusion on this issue. Some have suggested that without the Federal moratorium rider on the Interior bill drilling would be allowed within 3 miles of the Florida coast. That is just simply not the case. The Presidential moratorium would remain in place protecting Florida. Additionally, President Bush has pledged to ensure that Florida is permitted to maintain at least a 100-mile protective buffer. Moreover should the Presidential moratorium be removed, the Congress must enact legislation directing the Department of the Interior on where to permit Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) leases. This is not a one step process.

Some have suggested that allowing natural gas wells will do little to address the energy costs in the United States. This claim simply is not based on sound economics. As many of my colleagues know, over the past decade there has been a dramatic increase in the use of natural gas to produce electricity. Switching to natural gas for electric power generation has been a very quick and cost effective way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. According a 2005 report from the Florida Public Service Commission, in 2003, 26 percent of Florida's electric power was generated using natural gas. By 2013, just 6 years from now, the FPSC projects that over 50 percent of Florida's electric power will be generated using natural gas. The cost of natural gas for electric power generation has more than doubled since 2002 from about $3.00 per thousand cubic feet to more than $7.00 in 2007. Clearly, Florida is increasingly relying on natural gas to meet our everyday energy needs and ensuring a longer term affordable supply of natural gas will make Florida consumers' power bills more affordable.

When you consider this growing reliance on clean burning natural gas along with price increases we have seen, it is clear that Florida consumers will continue to pay higher costs for electricity if we don't expand our natural gas supply.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure that Florida has an adequate protective buffer while looking to meet our constituents' long-term clean energy needs.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of strengthening environmental protections, preserving public lands, and confronting global warming.

In the past 6 years of Republican budgets, our National Parks, forests, and wildlife refuges were recklessly neglected. The Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, the main entity responsible for enforcing environmental laws, was left scrambling for funding. Nonetheless, President Bush suggested another big cut in his budget request. Fortunately for the millions of people who enjoy our public lands and who rely on the EPA to protect our air and water, the new Democratic Congress is committed to reversing years of dereliction. Instead, we are making overdue investments in environmental protections.

The Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies appropriations bill (H.R. 2643) provides for modest, but crucial, funding increases in a number of areas including: $437 million above the President's request for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund that will allow approximately 150 communities to modernize their drinking water and wastewater infrastructure; $200 million increase over 2007 levels for the National Park Service to end a decade of declines in staffing, visitor services, and maintenance; $900 million more than the President proposed for EPA enforcement and scientific research.

This bill protects coastal ecosystems and communities by maintaining the longstanding moratoria on oil and gas drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf. This restriction protects the California coastlines that my constituents and I hold dear.

Finally, after years of denials and stonewalling by Republicans, this bill recognizes that climate change is a reality and requires us to act.

It would create a Commission on Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation to make recommendations on how to best respond to climate change. This long overdue step will allow us to begin to address the many challenges that global warming presents.

President Bush has issued a veto threat and called this bill ''irresponsible and excessive.'' What is truly ''irresponsible'' is wasting billions of dollars on a fraudulent war while ignoring the threat of global warming and failing to protect the environment and the public health. This bill begins to alter the dangerous environmental course that the President and the Republicans have led us down the last 6 years. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting yes.

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Chairman, the Report accompanying H.R. 2643, the fiscal year 2008 Interior and the Environment Appropriations Act, urges the Environmental Protection Agency to study the health and environmental effects of using trona in air pollution control systems. Trona is a naturally occurring, non-toxic mineral widely used in food additives, in glass manufacturing, paper, laundry products and medicine. It is odorless, non-combustible and stable in the air. Trona is a key ingredient of baking soda. Here in the United States, we are fortunate to have an abundance of this incredibly useful mineral. The Green River Basin of Wyoming is home to the world's largest trona deposit, and the Wyoming trona industry alone products close to 20 million tons of trona every year and employs more than 2,000 people.

For almost 20 years, trona has also played a critical and growing role in air pollution control at coal-fired power plants, cement plants, municipal incinerators and similar facilities around the country, including Alaska, Colorado, Florida, Virginia and Washington. Texas-based Solvay Chemicals, Inc. pioneered the use of trona in air pollution control systems, and it is the only company in the United States that produces trona products for that purpose.

Trona simply works in air pollution control systems, and it works incredibly well. The EPA, which has repeatedly approved the use of trona in air pollution control systems, reports that those systems have actually reduced sulfur dioxide emissions by more than 85 percent and hydrochloric acid emissions by 95 percent at several power plants around the country, without increasing particulate matter emissions.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2643. I want to thank my colleague and friend, Chairman NORM DICKS, for his tireless work in bringing to the floor a bill that we should all be proud of because of its commitment to protecting and conserving our environment and natural resources for future generations to enjoy.

John F. Kennedy said in March 1961, ''It is our task in our time and in our generation to hand down undiminished to those who come after us, as was handed down to us by those who went before, the natural wealth and beauty which is ours.'' In previous years we have

passed Interior Appropriations bills that do exactly the opposite—we have cut essential funding that has put our natural resources at risk as well as allowed policy decisions to hamper our ability to protect at-risk land, wilderness and wildlife. In previous years, I have stood before this Congress and expressed disappointment and anger with our complete disregard for environmental stewardship. But this year is different.

We finally have a bill that reflects where our budget priorities should be. While this legislation may not solve all of our problems, I believe it is an enormous step in the right direction.

First, I am proud to say that this bill allocates $50 million for the stateside grant program of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. The Land and Water Conservation Fund was separated into two components—the full federal program and the stateside grant program—to help address overdevelopment in both urban and rural areas. The stateside program has increased the number of recreation areas and facilities in our communities. It has also increased local involvement in land protection and open space preservation.

In New Jersey alone, the LWCF program has helped preserve of 73,000 acres of land by providing more than $111 million in funding. Some of the funding has been used to cleanup playgrounds, and build baseball fields, develop waterfront parks and restore open spaces. It is beyond me why the President continues to propose eliminating a program that is so successful. Fortunately, Chairman DICKS and the members of the Subcommittee understand the vital role this program plays in protecting and maintaining vital open spaces. They have invested in a program that remains a staple for conservation and land protection across the country.

These funds are long-term gifts that allow for the preservation of the wild and untouched places in America that our children and their children should have for their enjoyment.

These funds provide for Tuesday night baseball games and Sunday walks along the river, along with keeping what remains of our natural resources clean and pollutant free.

I also want to commend the committee for recognizing the dire situation of the National Parks. In preparation for the 100th anniversary of the National Parks System in 2016, we have included a hefty increase in the Parks budget for this fiscal year. This will go to park improvements, staffing increases, and visitor center upgrades in the Parks. Nearly a hundred years ago, Theodore Roosevelt urged the American people and the government to begin to conserve what natural resources we had so that some of the most majestic parts of this country would remain intact. With the 100-year anniversary of the National Park Service drawing closer, I echo the call to bring our National Parks up to standards.

Again, I would like to commend Chairman DICKS for crafting this bill before us today and I urge my colleagues to support it. By starting here today with this bill, we are voting for our sons and daughters and our grandchildren to be able to enjoy the natural resources of our country that so many of us have had the opportunity to experience in our lifetimes.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I submit the following for the RECORD.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2008 (H.R.2643)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Bureau of Land Management					
Management of lands and resources	866,911	879,438	888,628	+21,717	+9,190
(Energy cost recovery)	---	(21,000)	(20,000)	(+20,000)	(-1,000)
Construction	11,751	6,476	6,476	-5,275	---
Land acquisition	8,634	1,619	18,634	+10,000	+17,015
Oregon and California grant lands	108,991	110,242	110,242	+1,251	---
Range improvements (indefinite)	10,000	10,000	10,000	---	---
Service charges, deposits, & forfeitures (indefinite)	24,905	26,905	25,905	+1,000	-1,000
Offsetting fee collections	-24,905	-26,905	-25,905	-1,000	+1,000
Miscellaneous trust funds (indefinite)	12,405	12,405	12,405	---	---
Wildland fire management:					
Preparedness	274,863	268,334	274,863	---	+6,529
Fire suppression operations	249,185	294,398	294,398	+45,213	---
Other operations	234,307	239,117	237,383	+3,076	-1,734
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28)	95,000	---	---	-95,000	---
Subtotal	853,355	801,849	806,644	-46,711	+4,795
Total, Bureau of Land Management	1,872,047	1,822,029	1,853,029	-19,018	+31,000
United States Fish and Wildlife Service					
Resource management	1,013,969	1,034,520	1,104,572	+90,603	+70,052
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28)	7,398	---	---	-7,398	---
Construction	45,300	23,071	31,653	-13,647	+8,582
Land acquisition	28,046	18,011	43,046	+15,000	+25,035
Landowner incentive program	23,667	---	---	-23,667	---
Private stewardship grants	7,277	---	---	-7,277	---
Cooperative endangered species conservation fund	81,001	80,001	81,001	---	+1,000
National wildlife refuge fund	14,202	10,811	14,202	---	+3,391
North American wetlands conservation fund	39,412	42,646	42,646	+3,234	---
Neotropical migratory birds conservation fund	3,941	3,960	5,000	+1,059	+1,040
Multinational species conservation fund	6,404	4,257	10,000	+3,596	+5,743
State and tribal wildlife grants	67,492	69,492	85,000	+17,508	+15,508
Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service	1,338,109	1,286,769	1,417,120	+79,011	+130,351
National Park Service					
Operation of the national park system	1,847,897	2,058,632	2,046,809	+198,912	-11,823
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28)	525	---	---	-525	---
United States Park Police	---	---	---	---	---
Centennial Challenge	---	---	50,000	+50,000	+50,000
National recreation and preservation	54,369	48,885	62,881	+8,512	+13,996
Emergency appropriations (by transfer)(P.L.110-28)	(500)	---	---	(-500)	---
Historic preservation fund	55,663	63,658	81,500	+25,837	+17,842
Emergency appropriations (P.L.110-28)	10,000	---	---	-10,000	---
Emergency appropriations(transfer out)(P.L.110-28)	(-500)	---	---	(+500)	---
Construction and major maintenance	297,482	210,080	201,580	-95,902	-8,500
Land and water conservation fund (rescission of contract authority)	-30,000	-30,000	-30,000	---	---
Land acquisition and state assistance	64,024	22,529	99,402	+35,378	+76,873
Use of prior year balances	---	---	---	---	---
Total, National Park Service (net)	2,299,960	2,373,784	2,512,172	+212,212	+138,388
United States Geological Survey					
Surveys, investigations, and research	982,780	974,952	1,032,764	+49,984	+57,812
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28)	5,270	---	---	-5,270	---

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2008 (H.R.2643)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Minerals Management Service					
Royalty and offshore minerals management	281,342	290,778	289,282	+7,940	-1,496
Use of receipts	-128,730	-135,730	-135,730	-7,000	---
Oil spill research	6,903	6,403	6,403	-500	---
Ultra deepwater research deferral	---	---	-50,000	-50,000	-50,000
State royalty administrative cost deduction	---	---	-43,000	-43,000	-43,000
Total, Minerals Management Service	159,515	161,451	66,955	-92,560	-94,496
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement					
Regulation and technology	109,100	115,360	117,237	+8,137	+1,877
Receipts from performance bond forfeitures (indefinite)	98	100	100	+2	---
Subtotal	109,198	115,460	117,337	+8,139	+1,877
Abandoned mine reclamation fund (definite, trust fund)	185,393	52,835	52,774	-132,619	-61
Total, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	294,591	168,295	170,111	-124,480	+1,816
Bureau of Indian Affairs					
Operation of Indian programs	1,988,223	1,990,918	2,093,545	+105,322	+102,627
Construction	271,823	197,627	207,983	-63,840	+10,356
Indian land and water claim settlements and miscellaneous payments to Indians	42,000	34,069	39,136	-2,864	+5,067
Indian guaranteed loan program account	6,258	6,276	6,276	+18	---
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs	2,308,304	2,228,890	2,346,940	+38,636	+118,050
Departmental Offices					
Office of the Secretary	116,265	101,445	136,413	+20,148	+34,968
Insular Affairs:					
Assistance to Territories	48,477	47,201	50,572	+2,095	+3,371
Northern Marianas	27,720	27,720	27,720	---	---
Subtotal	76,197	74,921	78,292	+2,095	+3,371
Compact of Free Association	3,313	2,862	3,362	+49	+500
Mandatory payments	2,000	2,000	2,000	---	---
Subtotal	5,313	4,862	5,362	+49	+500
Total, Insular Affairs	81,510	79,783	83,654	+2,144	+3,871
Office of the Solicitor	55,018	58,949	59,250	+4,232	+301
Office of Inspector General	38,823	42,322	43,822	+4,999	+1,500
Office of Special Trustee for American Indians					
Federal trust programs	189,251	186,158	182,542	-6,709	-3,616
Indian land consolidation	34,006	10,000	10,000	-24,006	---
Total, Office of Special Trustee for American Indians	223,257	196,158	192,542	-30,715	-3,616
Total, Departmental Offices	514,873	478,657	515,681	+808	+37,024

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2008 (H.R.2643)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Department-wide Programs					
Payments in lieu of taxes	232,528	190,000	232,528	---	+42,528
Central hazardous materials fund	9,715	9,954	9,954	+239	---
Natural resource damage assessment fund	6,043	6,224	6,224	+181	---
Working capital fund	---	22,240	---	---	-22,240
Total, Department-wide programs	248,286	228,418	248,706	+420	+20,288
Total, title I, Department of the Interior	10,023,735	9,723,245	10,163,478	+139,743	+440,233
Appropriations	(9,935,542)	(9,753,245)	(10,193,478)	(+257,936)	(+440,233)
Emergency appropriations	(118,193)	---	---	(-118,193)	---
Rescission	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	---	---
TITLE II - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY					
Science and Technology	733,387	754,506	788,269	+54,882	+33,763
(By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)	(30,156)	(26,126)	(26,126)	(-4,030)	---
Commission on Climate Change Science	---	---	50,000	+50,000	+50,000
Environmental programs and management	2,358,370	2,298,188	2,375,582	+17,212	+77,394
Office of Inspector General	37,172	38,008	43,500	+6,328	+5,492
(By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)	(13,337)	(7,149)	(10,000)	(-3,337)	(+2,851)
Buildings and facilities	39,626	34,801	34,801	-4,825	---
Hazardous substance superfund	1,255,097	1,244,706	1,272,008	+16,911	+27,302
Transfer to Office of Inspector General	(-13,337)	(-7,149)	(-10,000)	(+3,337)	(-2,851)
Transfer to Science and Technology	(-30,156)	(-26,126)	(-26,126)	(+4,030)	---
Leaking underground storage tank program	72,035	92,235	117,961	+45,926	+25,726
Oil spill response	15,734	17,280	17,280	+1,546	---
Pesticide registration fund	10,000	10,000	10,000	---	---
Pesticide registration fees	-10,000	-10,000	-10,000	---	---
State and tribal assistance grants	2,100,634	1,679,479	2,277,667	+177,033	+598,188
Categorical grants	1,113,075	1,045,197	1,113,847	+772	+68,650
Subtotal, State and tribal assistance grants	3,213,709	2,724,676	3,391,514	+177,805	+666,838
Rescission	---	-5,000	-5,000	-5,000	---
Total, title II, Environmental Protection Agency	7,725,130	7,199,400	8,085,915	+360,785	+886,515
Appropriations	(7,725,130)	(7,204,400)	(8,090,915)	(+365,785)	(+886,515)
Rescissions	---	(-5,000)	(-5,000)	(-5,000)	---
(By transfer)	(43,493)	(33,275)	(36,126)	(-7,367)	(+2,851)
(Transfer out)	(-43,493)	(-33,275)	(-36,126)	(+7,367)	(-2,851)
TITLE III - RELATED AGENCIES					
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
Forest Service					
Forest and rangeland research	280,488	263,000	295,937	+15,449	+32,937
State and private forestry	279,761	202,458	280,602	+841	+78,144
National forest system	1,452,729	1,344,377	1,506,502	+53,773	+162,125
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28)	12,000	---	---	-12,000	---
Capital improvement and maintenance	436,400	422,565	520,197	+83,797	+97,632
Excess purchaser elect road funds	---	---	-40,000	-40,000	-40,000
Deferral of road and trail fund payment	---	---	-15,000	-15,000	-15,000
Subtotal	436,400	422,565	465,197	+28,797	+42,632
Land acquisition	41,936	15,703	44,485	+2,549	+28,782
Acquisition of lands for national forests, special acts	1,053	1,053	1,053	---	---
Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges (indefinite)	231	231	231	---	---
Range betterment fund (indefinite)	2,876	3,750	3,750	+874	---

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2008 (H.R.2643)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Gifts, donations and bequests for forest and rangeland research	63	56	56	-7	---
Management of national forest lands for subsistence uses	5,009	5,053	5,053	+44	---
Wildland fire management:					
Preparedness	665,382	349,082	675,382	+10,000	+326,300
Wildland firefighters	---	219,710	---	---	-219,710
Subtotal	665,382	568,792	675,382	+10,000	+106,590
Fire suppression operations	741,477	911,032	859,021	+117,544	-52,011
Other operations	416,744	388,803	440,245	+23,501	+51,442
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28)	370,000	---	---	-370,000	---
Subtotal, Wildland fire management	2,193,603	1,868,627	1,974,648	-218,955	+106,021
Total, Forest Service	4,706,149	4,126,873	4,577,514	-128,635	+450,641
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Indian Health Service					
Indian health services:					
Non-contract services	2,308,925	2,362,015	2,444,017	+135,092	+82,002
Contract care	499,562	551,515	561,515	+61,953	+10,000
Catastrophic health emergency fund	17,735	18,000	18,000	+265	---
Total, Indian health services	2,826,222	2,931,530	3,023,532	+197,310	+92,002
Indian health facilities	353,926	339,196	360,895	+6,969	+21,699
Total, Indian Health Service	3,180,148	3,270,726	3,384,427	+204,279	+113,701
National Institute of Health					
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences	79,117	78,434	79,117	---	+683
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry					
Toxic substances and environmental public health	75,212	75,004	75,212	---	+208
Total, Department of Health and Human Services	3,334,477	3,424,164	3,538,756	+204,279	+114,592
OTHER RELATED AGENCIES					
Executive Office of the President					
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality	2,698	2,703	2,703	+5	---
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board					
Salaries and expenses	9,113	9,049	9,549	+436	+500
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation					
Salaries and expenses	8,509	9,000	9,000	+491	---
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development					
Payment to the Institute	6,207	7,297	7,297	+1,090	---
Smithsonian Institution					
Salaries and expenses	536,295	571,347	536,295	---	-35,052
Facilities capital	98,600	107,100	116,100	+17,500	+9,000
Total, Smithsonian Institution	634,895	678,447	652,395	+17,500	-26,052

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2008 (H.R.2643)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
National Gallery of Art					
Salaries and expenses	95,767	97,983	101,850	+6,083	+3,867
Repair, restoration and renovation of buildings	15,962	18,017	18,017	+2,055	---
Total, National Gallery of Art	111,729	116,000	119,867	+8,138	+3,867
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts					
Operations and maintenance	17,575	20,000	20,200	+2,625	+200
Capital repair and restoration	12,814	19,350	23,150	+10,336	+3,800
Total, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	30,389	39,350	43,350	+12,961	+4,000
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars					
Salaries and expenses	9,100	8,857	10,000	+900	+1,143
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities					
National Endowment for the Arts					
Grants and administration	124,562	128,412	160,000	+35,438	+31,588
National Endowment for the Humanities					
Grants and administration	125,884	126,845	145,500	+19,616	+18,655
Matching grants	15,221	14,510	14,500	-721	-10
Total, National Endowment for the Humanities	141,105	141,355	160,000	+18,895	+18,645
Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities	265,667	269,767	320,000	+54,333	+50,233
Commission of Fine Arts					
Salaries and expenses	1,873	2,092	2,092	+219	---
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs					
Grants	7,143	---	10,000	+2,857	+10,000
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation					
Salaries and expenses	4,828	5,348	5,348	+520	---
National Capital Planning Commission					
Salaries and expenses	8,168	8,265	8,265	+97	---
United States Holocaust Memorial Museum					
Holocaust Memorial Museum	42,349	44,996	44,996	+2,647	---
Presidio Trust					
Presidio trust fund	19,706	18,450	22,400	+2,694	+3,950
White House Commission on the National Moment of Remembrance					
Operations	247	200	200	-47	---
Total, title III, related agencies	9,203,247	8,770,858	9,383,732	+180,485	+612,874
Appropriations	(8,821,247)	(8,770,858)	(9,438,732)	(+617,485)	(+667,874)
Emergency appropriations	(382,000)	---	(-55,000)	(-437,000)	(-55,000)

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2008 (H.R.2643)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE IV - GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Secure rural schools (emergency)(P.L. 110-28).....	425,000	---	---	-425,000	---
Grand total.....	27,377,112	25,693,503	27,633,125	+256,013	+1,939,622
Appropriations.....	(26,481,919)	(25,728,503)	(27,723,125)	(+1,241,206)	(+1,994,622)
Emergency appropriations.....	(925,193)	---	(-55,000)	(-980,193)	(-55,000)
Rescissions.....	(-30,000)	(-35,000)	(-35,000)	(-5,000)	---
(By transfer).....	(43,493)	(33,275)	(36,126)	(-7,367)	(+2,851)
(Transfer out).....	(-43,493)	(-33,275)	(-36,126)	(+7,367)	(-2,851)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Lewis of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2643 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House promptly with the following amendment:

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

TITLE VII—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 701. The effective date of section 115 of this Act and of title VI of this Act shall be the day that the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and the Energy Information Administration, certifies that nothing in this Act—

(1) shall reduce the amount of domestic energy available from the public lands of the United States;

(2) shall result in the increased imports of any energy otherwise available from the public lands of the United States; or

(3) shall result in higher costs, to Federal agencies funded in this Act, for gasoline, natural gas or home heating oil.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, no issue in this bill is more important than our striving towards energy independence, and to discuss that by way of our motion to recommit, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE), my colleague who is an expert on energy policy.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

I did make my living in oil and gas. I never owned one oil and gas well; but I will tell you, we went down holes. We were plumbers, and we fixed the oil wells and so I have seen the cost and difficulty of producing energy from a very close point of view. My wife and I employed 50 people in a small company that simply repaired oil weapons.

Reasonable people can have different points of view, but I have watched the trajectory of the Democrat energy bills, first H.R. 6, the energy bill that came through our Resources Committee and now this Interior Appropriations. And I will tell you that from my point of view, the Democratic energy agenda is anti-American energy. It insists that we import more. It is going to send more jobs to China and it is going to make life harder for Americans.

The motion to recommit simply says let's have the secretary certify. If you reasonably believe that I am wrong about my assumptions, we are going to send this back to the secretary to certify that nothing in this bill will reduce the amount of domestic energy or result in increased imports. I think if you believe in your bill, you should not be afraid to cause that review by the secretary and that certification that we are going to protect consumers. Because every one of us hear from consumers every day, our constituents, that the price of gasoline is too high. It is too high because of the policies that we in America, we in this American government have caused.

Section 115 is a very simple section. It is the only research and development section for ultra-deep oil. I can tell you that the deeper you go, the more expensive oil is to get. And it is not for the big companies, it is for the small companies that can't have research and development. The only research and development money that is available for small companies is in section 115. It has been taken out of every other section.

Shale oil is title VI. Shale oil is two times all the reserves of oil and gas in the entire world. Two times. It would make us self-sufficient, and yet we are removing shale oil.

My friends, these are the reasons that I believe the policies that are being promoted are anti-American and pro-import, will send jobs to China, and will make life harder for Americans.

The Washington Post, in review of the very first shot of this Democrat energy agenda, H.R. 6, The Washington Post said, ''This is something Hugo Chavez would be proud of.''

My friends, we are not on a track to make life easier for Americans; we are on a track to make life very difficult for the American economy and the American consumer.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, if the motion uses the word ''promptly,'' as this one does, it takes the bill off the floor and sends it back to the Appropriations Committee. The committee is not required to act because the instructions are considered merely advisory to the committee. In other words, by using the word ''promptly,'' they would kill the bill.

Now this motion to recommit is simply a device to protect excess profits of the energy companies. It does this by overturning section 115 of the bill. This section simply requires energy companies who are realizing $9 billion of excess profits to renegotiate the faulty leases which were signed in 1997 and 1998. In legal terms, this is called ''unjust enrichment'' at the expense of the taxpayers.

The motion overturns section 115 by delaying it until impossible conditions are met, as certified by the secretary. If this language is adopted, these enormous unjustified profits will continue for an industry making tens of billions of dollars of profit.

Adoption of the amendment would kill the bill and with so many good things in it, I urge all Members to vote against the motion to recommit.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX and the order of the House of June 26, 2007, the Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 186, nays 233, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 578]

YEAS—186

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry

Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—233

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

NOT VOTING—13

Boehner
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
DeFazio
Delahunt
Feeney
Hall (TX)
Melancon
Miller, George
Ortiz
Sanchez, Loretta
Sessions
Weldon (FL)

□ 1806

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 272, nays 155, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 579]

YEAS—272

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Foxx
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Heller
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
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
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—155

Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Cardoza
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kanjorski
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Walberg
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Frank (MA)
Ortiz
Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised they have less than 1 minute to vote.

□ 1812

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.