



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 26, 2005

No. 72

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Lord God, our Defender in Battle and Cause of Peace, be with this body as it completes its legislative work this week and asks Your blessing upon the Nation.

This Congress is ever assisted by liaison offices and the personnel of our military forces in the United States. This tour of duty by the military here on Capitol Hill must be most pleasing in Your sight, as our Supreme Commander.

With strategic information and military training, this liaison force helps Congressional Members and committees to resolve military issues and accomplish mutual undertakings that solidify necessary operations by this government. The daily work of men and women of the military bolsters the House of Representatives and its resolve to protect and defend this Nation. Their constant presence is a regular invitation of all of us to turn to You, Almighty God, and lift up to You all our men and women in military uniform and their families, especially those who are presently deployed in Afghanistan and Iraq.

As Memorial Day approaches, we praise You, Lord God, and thank You for the service and dedication of our military, especially those who have made the ultimate sacrifice of themselves for the good of us all. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California (Ms. LINDA T.

SÁNCHEZ) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain 10 1-minute speeches per side.

CONGRATULATIONS TO KEY WEST HIGH SCHOOL

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate the newest baseball, State of Florida, High School Champions, the Key West High School baseball team.

Located in the southernmost point of Florida, the Conchs captured their 11th State title by beating Orlando Bishop Moore by a score of 7-0. This is the first State title for the Conchs since 1998, capping an incredible season.

At the beginning of the year, the Conchs were ranked fifth in the Nation by Baseball America Magazine, and they surely did not disappoint. Their 27-to-5 record demonstrates their commitment and their resilience, Mr. Speaker.

Key West High School is the little school that could; and, boy, they sure did. Congratulations to the Key West High School baseball team on its incredible season. Hats off to the athletes, their proud parents, the coaching staff, the school administrator, the Monroe County Public School Superintendent Randy Acevedo, and all of the proud residents of Monroe County, and most especially Key West. Their

win is a victory for all of Monroe County. Go Conchs!

UNIVERSAL HEALTH CARE FOR ALL

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, health care in this country is a crisis of major proportions. Seniors are still splitting pills to make their medications last. People will not go to a doctor because they cannot afford it. Only if some are near death will they rush to the hospital. It is clearly time for a universal, single payer, not-for-profit health care system called Medicare For All, and that is exactly what H.R. 676, sponsored by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and by myself would achieve.

Medicare For All will cost the same amount the Nation currently spends for health care overall, but funds will be reallocated to cover everyone, to improve care and eliminate cost for individuals. And here is what would be covered: all medically necessary procedures, primary care and prevention, inpatient care, outpatient care, emergency care, prescription drugs, long-term care, mental health, dental health, and vision care, as well as chiropractic services.

It is time for us to realize a primary purpose of our government is to make sure our people are healthy. Health care is a basic right in a democratic society.

I am urging support for H.R. 676.

COMMENDING LAKE WORTH, FLORIDA POLICE DEPARTMENT ON HEROIC RESPONSE

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

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H4075

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, at 3:48 a.m. on the morning of Sunday, May 22, an 8-year-old girl from my hometown of Lake Worth, Florida, was reported missing. She was thought to have been abducted by someone she knew and the Lake Worth Police Department quickly went into action.

In coordination with the Florida Department of Law Enforcement, an Amber Alert was issued at 7:30 a.m. and an all-points bulletin, including off-duty police, were called in to respond. Under the leadership of Deputy Chief Patrick Hampshire, more than 100 officers from five agencies responded within an hour.

Sergeant Michael Hall was charged with searching for her at the city dump. Opening a large bin, Sergeant Hall found cement blocks, but on a second look he saw the faint shadow of a small hand. With the help of Corporal Robert Cresswell of the Palm Beach Sheriff's Department, Lieutenant Dave Matthews of the Lake Worth Police Department, Special Agent Mike Driscoll of the Florida Department of Law Enforcement, the searchers were able to get this young girl out from under these blocks and debris and save her life. SWAT Medic Earl Bakki gave her medical attention until she could get to the hospital.

Mr. Speaker, these are true heroes, working as a team and using the tools they had been provided to save this young, precious life. I want to commend Chief William Smith and the members of the Lake Worth Police Department for their swift, heroic response on Sunday, as well as the Palm Beach County Sheriff's Department, Lantana Police Department, Boca Raton Police Department, the Florida Department of Law Enforcement for aiding in the search for this young girl.

TRIBUTE TO KATIE BROWNELL

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

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute a young girl who is truly in a league of her own, Kate Brownell.

Katie is a shy 11-year-old girl of few words, but when she gets on the baseball field she lets her pitching do the talking, and she rocks. Brownell is the only girl in the Oakfield-Alabama Little League Baseball Program. Last week, she threw a perfect game for the Dodgers in an 11-0 victory for the Yankees.

How dominant was she? She struck out all 18 batters she faced, yielding no more than two balls to any batter in a 6-inning victory. Katie accomplished something that league officials cannot remember anyone, boy or girl, ever doing. Brownell is not just good at pitching, she is also great at the plate, and her batting average is .714.

When I first read her story, I was excited and inspired by this young girl's

talent. I was so impressed that I wanted to be sure to come down to the floor and recognize her achievement. She exemplifies what you can achieve, regardless of gender.

That is why it is bewildering to me that in this day and age we are debating whether or not to allow women in combat. If anything, young women like Katie serve to remind us that we can pretty much do anything that men can, and sometimes even better.

WE NEED THE MARRIAGE PROTECTION AMENDMENT

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the States should decide. Is that not what we heard in debate on gay marriage?

Well, that is what Nebraska did, with a constitutional amendment passed by their State legislature and approved by over 70 percent of their voters in a referendum. The State decided that the definition of marriage should be limited to one man and one woman, a definition that nearly everyone in this country agrees with.

But recently an activist Federal judge disagreed and the duly enacted law of the State, the decision of the State and its reelected representatives and voters, was overruled by an activist Federal court.

Does not sound like States deciding to me. On the contrary, it is exactly what many of us have said would happen, activist courts would erode the will of the people in States like Nebraska. The other side, the side screaming for States' rights just 10 months ago, has not said a word while Federal courts decide and impose their will of what marriage is on the States.

This is too far. We need to act. The Federal Marriage Protection Amendment will ensure that States decide this issue of critical importance. If the other side really believes their own rhetoric, they will back this amendment and fight for judges who allow the people and their elected representatives to debate and decide cultural issues.

CARIBBEAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE BILL

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, there are many Caribbean Americans who have helped to shape American government, politics, business, arts, education, science and culture: Sidney Poitier, Tito Puente, Colin Powell, Edwidge Danticat, Harry Belafonte, Julia Alvarez, Kelsey Grammer, Wyclef Jean, Celia Cruz, Mervyn Dymally, Raul Julia, Jesus Colon, Gloria Estafan, Shirley Chisholm, Alex Rodriguez, and John Point du Sable. These are just a

few Caribbean Americans who have contributed so much to the United States.

This year, I reintroduced a resolution which we introduced last year, H. Con. Res. 71. It is a bipartisan and long-overdue effort to create a national Caribbean American Heritage Month. I ask all of my colleagues to join me, the 72 cosponsors, and numerous Caribbean American voices from across the country who have supported this measure.

When we return from the Memorial Day recess, I hope the House will consider this bipartisan goodwill resolution that honors the legacy and the diversity of the Caribbean American community. It is long overdue.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I came to the floor to share great economic news from my State of Tennessee. We had just learned that Tennessee expects to have a \$272 million boost in sales revenue, State revenues. It appears that our fight to restore the sales tax deductibility to our Federal income tax is paying off big time, and we thank the leadership for that.

But, Mr. Speaker, the good thing we have learned is that this news is not just limited to Tennessee. Just this morning the Bureau of Economic Analysis revised the Nation's first quarter growth upward. America's GDP grew at 3.5 percent, not 3.1 percent, as had previously been estimated.

If you do not know what that means, let me tell you. It means that the Republican support for lower taxes and less regulation is paying off. It works. It works. In April, America's free enterprise system created 274,000 new jobs.

Everyone in this body should recognize the fact that our leadership and our majority are putting America on the right track for growth and job creation.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF REPUBLICAN-LED CONGRESS TO DATE

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as we head home for the Memorial Day recess this weekend, let us take a look at all of the accomplishments of our Republican-led Congress so far this year: bankruptcy reform, class action fairness, REAL ID Act with immigration reform, permanent repeal of the death tax, continuity of government, comprehensive energy policy, and many others that I would like to list, but the time is too short.

All of these bills were overwhelming bipartisan and overwhelming

common-sense, good government legislation. Constituents will appreciate the fact that Republicans are listening to their concerns and taking positive, productive steps to reach solutions.

There is much work to do, and we are methodically getting that work done. It may not be flashy, but it is responsibility in action, and Americans appreciate this. Republicans will continue to tackle the tough issues of the day rather than pass the buck on to future generations. Americans may not read about it in their newspapers or hear about it on the nightly news; however, solutions are happening here and now.

Mr. Speaker, success is defined in terms of solutions, not in terms of rhetoric, and solutions are what Republicans are bringing to the American people.

□ 1015

IN HONOR OF TODD VENETTE

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mourn the loss of a great American, Todd Venette, whose life was cut short by a terrorist attack in Iraq.

Todd, a former Marine, was helping Iraq's young democracy as a government contractor when he was killed by a terrorist car bomb in Baghdad. As his friends and family would tell you, Todd was a selfless person who volunteered to reenlist shortly after the war in Iraq started. When he completed his tour, his dedication to the mission led him to return to Iraq as a government contractor.

A giving person, a mentor, and a servant are among the words that have been used to describe Todd. As a firefighter in Russellville, Arkansas, Todd helped protect the community. His service to the people of Russellville did not end there. Todd was instrumental in establishing a wrestling program for kids at the local Boys and Girls Club, putting his talents to work as a mentor to shape the lives of young people of Russellville in a positive way.

Mr. Speaker, Todd touched many people in his short life. I ask my colleagues to keep Todd's family and friends in their thoughts and prayers during these very difficult times.

RECOGNIZING JIM LONGWORTH

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Triad Today for being awarded the Spectrum of Democracy Award for Responsible Election Coverage by the North Carolina Center For Voter Education. The program is aired in the Fifth Congressional District on Sinclair Broadcast-

ing's WXLV/WUPN station covering the Winston-Salem/Greensboro/High Point metropolitan area.

Triad Today was created October 2003 by veteran television broadcaster, author, and columnist Jim Longworth. It is the Piedmont Triad's only local television talk show. Its guests have included Senators and Congressmen, mayors and sports celebrities like Richard Petty. But most of the time it serves the community by disseminating information about the issues that matter the most to the community, like health care, public safety, and government.

But it was another kind of public service for which Triad Today was recently recognized. During the 2004 election cycle, Jim Longworth distributed free blocks of air time on his show to scores of congressional and gubernatorial candidates. His action helped raise citizen awareness of candidates and issues and encouraged more people to participate in the political process. For this, Mr. Longworth and Triad Today were awarded the Spectrum of Democracy Award.

Mr. Speaker, the press has a responsibility to fulfill its role as the fourth estate, that is, to serve as a guardian of democracy and defender of the public interest. I am pleased to congratulate Triad Today for its outstanding commitment to keeping the community informed.

REPUBLICANS RETURN CONTROL TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan once said that the government's view of the economy could be summed up in a few short phrases: if it moves, tax it. If it keeps moving, regulate it; and if it stops moving, subsidize it.

I believe the American people, not the government, have a better view of our economy. By working to remove the economic barriers of taxation, litigation and regulation, House Republicans are returning control of the economy to the American people. The 109th Congress has passed legislation this year which will permanently repeal the death tax, decrease the deficit, strengthen American borders, prevent frivolous lawsuits, improve our highways, and provide our country with a comprehensive energy policy.

In my home State of South Carolina, the unemployment rate continues to decrease and over 1,300 new jobs have been created since March. This great news is positive proof that the Republican leaders are creating more jobs, growing the economy, and returning control to the American people.

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

THE HISTORY OF MEMORIAL DAY

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to celebrate Memorial Day, let me give a brief history lesson. We know that Southern families decorated the graves of their fallen friends after the Civil War on what was known as Decoration Day.

However, it was a former Member of Congress, a Democrat-turned-Republican, an individual who got elected to the Senate, General John A. Logan, who gets credit for memorializing Memorial Day as he established the Grand Army of the Republic and issued General Order 31 which formerly established Memorial Day.

General Logan was from Illinois in the deep southern part of the State. He was a congressman, a U.S. Senator and a vice presidential candidate. He is memorialized with a statue here in Washington, DC and a statue in Raleigh, North Carolina, where he kept Union soldiers from burning down the city. He also has a community college named after him in the southern part of the State of Illinois.

As we remember the men and women who have fallen in combat, let us also remember our soldiers from all wars and the folks that made it possible for us to have and celebrate Memorial Day, and one of those individuals is General John A. Logan.

HONORING OUR VETERANS

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the conclusion of the Civil War, a group of veterans began a tradition known as Decoration Day. The day was set aside to decorate the graves of the men who had perished during battle, and it was believed Decoration Day was always during the month of May because flowers needed for the occasion were finally blooming. Two centuries later, Decoration Day is now Memorial Day, but two core traditions remain: we honor those who died protecting our Nation, and we still do so in May when the flowers are blooming.

Today, as our Nation spends its third consecutive Memorial Day at war, we remember the men and women who made the ultimate sacrifice defending the precious gift of liberty. We honor the people who have left behind husband, wives, children and parents, as well as the riches and celebrations of life, to fight for the freedoms of all Americans; and we should remain always mindful of that symbolic tradition of Decoration Day, that flowers will bloom, a beautiful America will bloom from the sacrifices made by our fallen veterans.

Mr. Speaker, we give thanks for the service of our veterans; and to those who served and paid the ultimate price, we give our deepest thanks.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2528, MILITARY QUALITY OF LIFE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 298 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 298

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2528) making appropriations for military quality of life functions of the Department of Defense, military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 298 is an open rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2528, the Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act of 2006. The rule allows for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. It waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. It waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI, prohibiting unauthorized appropriations or legisla-

tive provisions in an appropriations bill.

It authorizes the Chair to accord priority and recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Under the rules of the House, the bill shall be read for amendment by paragraph.

Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to present for consideration the rule for the very first Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs Appropriation bill. This important subcommittee was formed to take an all-inclusive look at the programs related to the quality of life for the brave servicemen and -women who currently serve America in the Armed Forces, their families and those men and women who sacrificed so much for our freedom in the past.

I also believe the bill before us achieves this important goal in a fiscally responsible manner. The new subcommittee held 14 hearings this year covering a wide range of issues pertaining to their new jurisdiction, and I believe their product is a strong one.

The underlying bill totals \$121.8 billion of which \$85.2 billion is discretionary and \$36.6 billion is mandatory. The discretionary funding level represents a \$1 billion increase above the President's request and \$5.9 billion above last year's enacted level. The bill funds the Department of Veterans Affairs at \$68.1 billion, \$2.3 billion above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level, and \$635 million above the 2006 budget request.

Particularly important is the \$21 billion for veterans medical services, \$1.6 billion above the 2005 enacted level and a billion dollars more than the budget request. This is an 8.5 percent increase over last year's level, and an 18.2 percent increase in medical services from fiscal year 2004.

Perhaps most importantly, and what I heard the most about from the veterans back home in northwest Georgia, is that this bill does not contain any new fees for veterans medical services or prescription drugs. The bill restores funding for long-term care to the level it was in the fiscal year 2005 appropriation legislation, and the bill directs the Secretary to work with the National Association of State Veterans Homes to generate an agreeable policy to make the program function more effectively for the veterans and for the taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, there are two State veterans homes in Georgia that are hugely important to many aging citizens and their families, and I am personally grateful for this measure.

Additionally, the bill includes language directing the Department to spend more than \$2.2 billion on specialty mental health care in fiscal year 2006, an important issue that many Members of Congress brought to the attention of the chairman. The subcommittee also included report language directing the VA to double the

funding available for mental health research.

For the Department of Defense, the bill provides a total of \$53.5 billion, and within this total is funding for military construction, for family housing construction and maintenance, basic allowance for housing payments, facilities maintenance, modernization, and environmental restoration.

Also included in this bill is \$20 billion for the Defense health program. This is an increase of \$1.8 billion above the fiscal year 2005 enacted level, and it is \$192.3 million above the 2006 Presidential budget request.

This amount will sufficiently allow for ongoing preparation of our brave soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines while caring also for their families at home.

□ 1030

Finally, the subcommittee has allowed for greatly enhanced interaction between the Department of Defense and the VA to explore joint ventures that can enhance a continuity of services provided between the two departments.

Mr. Speaker, in a tough budget year such as this, we have a responsibility to make sure that scarce resources are allocated in the most effective and efficient manner possible. This bill achieves that goal.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge Subcommittee Chairman WALSH, Ranking Subcommittee Member EDWARDS and, of course, Chairman LEWIS for their vision and hard work on this bill. I look forward to this debate, and I encourage my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first year that the House will consider a military quality of life-VA appropriations bill. As a result of the subcommittee realignment adopted earlier this year by the Appropriations Committee, military construction, Defense Department health programs and all veterans' programs are now contained in this one appropriations bill.

I want to commend Chairman WALSH and Ranking Member EDWARDS for the bill that they have crafted. Both gentlemen are well known for their skill at reaching out and working in a bipartisan manner and this bill reflects that collaboration as well as their deep commitment to our uniformed men and women and their families, both those in current service and those who have honored our Nation with past service.

Regrettably, while H.R. 2528 is a significant improvement over the President's shameful budget for veterans' health care, even this bill will not get the job done for the men and women who are depending on the Department

of Veterans Affairs to meet their health care needs. I appreciate that this bill is \$1 billion more than the President suggested for veterans' medical services, but a significant portion of that increase is offset by cutting the very personnel and equipment necessary for the VA to carry out its mission and provide timely, and quality, service to our veterans. Further, the increases in this bill are simply not enough to keep up with inflation and the rapidly growing number of veterans needing services from the VA.

Mr. Speaker, more than 20 percent of soldiers who have left active duty after service in Iraq or Afghanistan have sought health care services from the VA, and with no end of combat in sight, I am sure that that number will continue to rise. Recent studies show that the mental and psychological impact of war is taking its toll on our newest generation of veterans. Through February 11, 2005, according to a study performed by the VA, over 17,000 veterans of the Iraq and Afghanistan wars have been diagnosed with mental disorders. The New England Journal of Medicine reported last July that nearly one in five soldiers is leaving the war with post-traumatic stress disorder and other mental health problems.

How can we ensure the successful treatment and rehabilitation of these veterans when we know that the system in place is already insufficient to meet current needs?

Mr. Speaker, this bill does not meet the needs of our veterans, old or new, because it simply does not provide the resources for the transition from soldier to veteran. It does not provide the resources needed to update and modernize crumbling facilities. It does not provide the funds to adequately staff and equip veterans' health care problems. You can spin it all you want, but those are the facts.

This is an important question of priorities, Mr. Speaker, and the Members of this House should have a chance to debate and vote on these priorities.

Last night in the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) presented a very simple amendment to provide an additional \$2.6 billion for veterans' health care. To pay for this increase, the amendment proposed reducing the tax cut for people making over \$1 million this year in taxable income from \$140,000 to \$129,000.

But the Republicans on the Rules Committee said "no," Mr. Speaker. They voted not to allow the amendment to be debated on the floor today. They voted to deny every Member of this House from expressing what their priorities would be if given a chance to vote on the matter: a slightly smaller tax cut for millionaires? Or \$2.6 billion for our veterans? That is the choice. A smaller tax cut for millionaires, or to make sure our veterans get the health care that they need and that they deserve and have earned.

Mr. Speaker, it was even suggested in the Rules Committee last night that millionaires need this tax cut more than our veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan need the services provided by the veterans' health system. I could not disagree more. If this rule passes, the Members of this House will be denied their right to debate and vote on whether or not it is a priority for them to adequately fund the VA and health care for America's veterans.

At the end of this debate today, Mr. Speaker, I will call for a vote on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will amend the rule so that we can consider and vote on the Obey amendment to increase funding for veterans' health services.

Last night, Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority on this floor voted to deny adequate health care to our National Guard and Reserves. It was shameful what happened on the floor last night. Today, they have a chance to redeem themselves by voting "no" on the previous question and allowing the Obey amendment to be voted on on this floor today.

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

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

In regard to the gentleman's comments about mental health care for our veterans, for the first time ever, the President proposed and Congress provided a dedicated pool of resources, actually \$2.2 billion, to provide specialty mental health care to veterans, particularly those who are returning from the combat area, as so many are now.

In order to better serve combat veterans, the Department of Veterans Affairs is directed to do a comprehensive study on post-traumatic stress disorder, focusing on improving mental health, mental health research, mental health care and access to information. In addition, in encouraging better cooperation and care of veterans and active military personnel, VA and the Department of Defense are directed to develop a plan to improve seamless transition on internal and external obstacles to transition and recommendations that would continue to enhance the continuity of care.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to total spending on VA medical care, let us just go back to 1999 and come forward to 2005 over the last 6 years. In 1999, VA medical care appropriations were \$17.8 billion. In fiscal year 2005, that number was \$29.9 billion. The increases over those 6 years:

1999 to 2000, 9.2 percent;
2000 to 2001, 11.3 percent;
2001 to 2002, a lean year, as we all know, because of the economy and 9/11; nevertheless, a 4.6 percent increase;
2002 to 2003, 11.9, an almost 12 percent increase;
2003 to 2004, another 11.4 percent increase;
2004 to 2005, a 6.2 percent increase.

The commitment is there. Absolutely the numbers show it. I do not see how anybody could refute that.

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

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

Let me just respond to the gentleman. He talks about how the Republican majority has increased the amount of money that we are spending on veterans' issues. But the bottom line is, we are at war and there are more and more veterans coming back. And so you can spin this all you want, but what you are providing in this bill is not nearly enough to take care of the needs of our veterans. That is a fact.

It is not just me saying it. The American Legion sent a letter to the Congress saying the same thing, that VA medical care is approximately \$2.5 billion short for fiscal year 2006. They write, As Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom veterans continue to seek timely access to the VA health care delivery system, older veterans should not be kicked to the curb to make room for the newest generation of wartime veterans.

The coalition of Amvets, Paralyzed Veterans of America, Disabled American Veterans and Veterans of Foreign Wars have endorsed the Obey amendment because, they wrote, the Obey amendment would provide the funding needed to meet fixed costs and to care for returning veterans as well as provide the resources the VA needs to meet shortfalls that are affecting veterans today.

We are asking you to support this amendment and to provide the dollars needed to care for servicemembers returning from Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as all veterans who rely upon the VA to provide their health care.

Almost every veterans organization in this country is saying that what we are doing here today is not enough. You can say that you have increased it a little bit, but the bottom line is that we are at war. We are in Afghanistan and we are in Iraq, and more and more veterans are coming back, and we do not have the resources in this bill to adequately take care of their needs.

Let us be clear. Let us not try to spin to the American people that somehow we are doing our job here. The Republican leadership has made a choice. They would rather spend the money to provide more tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires than adequately fund the VA budget. I think at a time of war that that is just absolutely wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to my colleague on the committee, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

(Ms. MATSUI asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that the last bill we take up before recessing for the Memorial Day District Work Period is the military quality of life appropriations bill, the bill which includes funding for Veterans Affairs. Today, when we pass this

bill and fund veterans' programs, we are reaffirming the promise we made to each veteran when they agreed to serve and protect our Nation. Part of that promise, one of the most important promises, is to provide them with superior medical care.

While I do commend the committee for increasing funding for veterans' health care over the President's request, as the gentleman from Massachusetts mentioned, even leading veterans' groups state it does not increase funding enough. The funding does not keep pace with the rising population of veterans or the rising cost of health care.

Yesterday, as the gentleman from Massachusetts also mentioned, the Rules Committee had the opportunity to make in order an amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) that would have increased funding for veterans' health care to the necessary levels. The Republican majority chose not to. This is truly, truly unfortunate.

Most Members, myself included, have already heard from veterans in their district that they have to wait far too long for medical care. In some instances, veterans face wait times of up to 6 months. Yet the bill before us does not provide the funding necessary to provide prompt access to health services. And with our ongoing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, the number of veterans needing medical service will only continue to rise.

I am truly thankful that those men and women honorably serving our Nation in the world's hot spots are likely to return home to their family and friends. With protective armor and the improving quality of medical treatment in the field, more of our servicemembers are surviving combat wounds and returning, though with an increased need for medical service. Many of these men and women are amputees who will need months of rehabilitation to learn to walk and use prosthetic limbs. Because of these injuries, the men and women of our Armed Forces will need continuous care for the rest of their lives.

At a time when American men and women are serving our Nation in hostile environments, we must demonstrate our intent to fulfill our promise and fund veterans' medical services at the highest possible level. We must provide them with the most efficient and highest quality medical care this country can offer.

I hope that on the floor today, we can make in order the gentleman from Wisconsin's amendment increasing our commitment to veterans.

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

In regard to the comment about the waiting time for our veterans to receive care, we had several years ago, and I want to respond, of course, to the gentlewoman from California about her concerns, but there was a waiting time of greater than 6 months for up to 350,000 veterans. I think most of those

were in Category, priority level, 7 and 8. But because of increased funding and policy change, that number was reduced to 36,000.

We do not want to have, Mr. Speaker, any of our veterans having to wait 6 months or more. But to cut that down from hundreds of thousands to 36,000, I think, is significant progress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a member of the subcommittee.

□ 1045

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the thing, I guess, that irks me the most, some of the Members on the other side come from the liberal left. They do not support the military. They vote against defense bills. They vote against defense supplementals, which protect our men and women and gives them the equipment and things they need to survive to do their job and come back alive. Many of these same Members give a cry for the veterans that we want to increase above budget, we want to increase that, because they know they vote. We want them to come back alive.

When the Democrats had control of this House, they cut the military COLAs. They cut veterans' COLAs. They increased Social Security tax. They increased the tax on the veterans and the military. And cut their health care, VFW and American Legion chastised the Democrats because they not only just level funded it or reduced it, they gutted it. And I still have the articles in my office about how the Democrats did not come up to speed on the health care for the veterans.

Since we took the majority over the last few years, we have increased health care over 60 percent. Subvention was my bill for the military, TRICARE for everybody.

Another thing last night where they said, well, the Republicans did not vote to take care of our National Guard, they sign a contract, Mr. Speaker. When one goes into the National Guard or Reserve, they are a citizen soldier. They sign up and they are working in a business and they get your health care through the business or they sign up with private insurance.

My colleagues on the other side want socialized medicine. They want single-payer, government controlled system. If the government gets involved in that, all of a sudden we are up around \$5-plus billion, and the private sector will not provide for it. And they tried to use it as a political pawn. It sickens me. I am military retired, and I have health care, and so do our veterans in an increasing manner.

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

Let me say just to the gentleman from California who referred to the vote we had yesterday to provide more health care benefits to our Guard and Reserves, he may not think that an important thing to do, but those of us on

this side do, especially when we are relying on them more and more to be the soldiers on the frontline in Iraq and Afghanistan.

And I also want to point out that currently about 50,000 of our veterans are waiting in line for at least 6 months for veterans health care, and that problem will only gets worse with the growing number of returning soldiers from Operation Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom. And as of May, 2005, the Department of Veterans Affairs had treated more than 85,000 of the 360,675 veterans from these deployments. In 2006 the Department expects to treat 5.2 million veterans, double the number in 1995. And overall, the medical care inflation rate for 2004 was close to double the inflation rate.

So, Mr. Speaker, again, the point here is if we are going to send our young men and women overseas to fight wars, then I think we have an obligation, a moral obligation, to make sure they have the health care and the support when they return home that they not only deserve but they have earned.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, appropriation bills represent the legislation where we have a chance to put our money where our rhetoric is. On Veterans' Day, I would venture to say that virtually every Member of this House has gone home and spoken about how much we care for veterans, and I am sure on Memorial Day that many Members will be going home and they will put their hands over their hearts and say how much they respect veterans.

When wars start, we are very good at having the bands play. We are very good at having the crowds cheer. But all too often, when those veterans come home, they do not get the same treatment. They certainly did not during Vietnam. And I think the test of our concern for veterans is not the kind of speeches we give as we send them off to war. It is the kind of treatment we give them when they get home.

Now, we can brag all we want about the fact that this bill is a billion dollars above the President's for veterans health care. Fine. I am glad it is. But the fact is that still does not keep up with the cost of inflation. The fact is there are still waiting lists and waiting lines. The fact is that VA facilities are still badly in need of repair. The fact is we still do not do enough prosthesis research.

Next year, the VA expects to handle twice as many veterans as they did in 1995, and medical care inflation is twice the rate of inflation in the regular economy.

The reason this bill is so squeezed is because the budget resolution, which this House passed about a month ago, has imposed tight limits on this Congress's ability to fund veterans

health care and a number of other areas because the number one priority in that budget bill was tax cuts and we wound up guaranteeing to everybody who makes \$1 million a year or more that they will take home a tax cut of \$140,000 on average this year.

The amendment that I wanted the Committee on Rules to make in order was very simple. We simply wanted this House to reconsider that tax package and to shave that \$140,000 average tax cut down to 129,000 bucks. I think every American would be very happy to settle for a \$129,000 tax cut this year. If we simply shaved it down to 129,000 bucks for people making over 1 million bucks a year, we would be able to put \$2.6 billion more into veterans health care.

In the past, this country has always thrived because it believed in the sense of shared sacrifice. How is the sacrifice being shared today? We are asking those who wear the uniform of the United States, whether they be regular forces or Guard or Reserves, we are asking them to bear the full burden of our effort in Iraq and Afghanistan. And what burden are we asking the folks to bear here at home? We are saying, "Oh, they have got to sacrifice by taking a tax cut." What we are asking is that we adjust that sense of shared sacrifice so that we shave the benefits for people who are already the most blessed in this society, we shave their tax benefits by just a little bit in order to make just a little bit more room for veterans health care. And I make no apology for trying to do that.

I believe that we need to remember Abraham Lincoln's admonition in the second inaugural address: "To care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan." This Congress has taken some initiatives to do that this year. But it is not enough. I plead fully guilty to wanting to have health care for every single American. I think it is a mortal sin that there are 45 million Americans who do not have health care coverage, but at the very least, we ought to see to it that every person who wears the uniform of the United States has whatever health care they need whenever they need it.

We do not worry about how much a war is going to cost when we start one or when we get into one. We pay the cost. We should also not worry about how much it is going to cost to provide adequate health care for people who fight that war. Whatever they need is what we ought to provide, and there is not a Member in this House who can demonstrate that this bill is fully adequate. Is it better than the President's budget? Of course. Anything would be. But it is not enough, and we have tried to show a way for us to provide more funding for veterans without doing serious damage to anybody else's interests in this country.

And I would hope we would turn down the previous question so that we have a chance to offer that amendment.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the gentleman from Massachusetts: Has he ever been in the Guard?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. No, Mr. Speaker. But I am in awe of those who serve this country.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, has he ever been in the Reserves?

Mr. MCGOVERN. No, I have not.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Has he ever been in active duty military?

Mr. MCGOVERN. No, Mr. Speaker. But I support these men and women who are serving our country, and they deserve health care, which it is a disgrace what the Republican majority did.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I have. And I thought not.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it was shameful what happened on the House floor, and they have an opportunity to redeem themselves today.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thought not, Mr. Speaker.

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

I should say to the gentleman I respect his service as well. I just wish he would join with us in providing the adequate allocation for our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, just to follow up on the last comment of my colleague who has served our Nation so well in service in the military, let me just point out that Vice President CHENEY did not serve our country in the military. And I do not think any one of us in this room would have the right, based on that, to question his allegiance to our country or his commitment to our servicemen and -women.

I do not want to get into a partisan debate between Republicans and Democrats over military service. What I do want to do is raise one simple question: Should this House not have the right to vote on the Obey amendment, which would provide a \$2.6 billion increase for veterans health care, education, and other programs? Should we not have the right during a time of war to vote on that?

Now, the gentleman from Georgia said in his comments that this rule waives points of order against the bill. My follow-up question is if the House Committee on Rules waives points of order against the bill to pass the bill, would it not be fair to say why do we not waive one point of order against an amendment in order to help veterans receive better health care? This would not be the first time, if my Republican colleagues will check the record, that they would have waived a point of order to allow a tax measure to be part

of an appropriations bill. It has been done multiple times by this leadership in this House.

The point has been made that VA health care has been increased by, I believe, 40 percent over the last 5 years. And that is correct, and I think that has been a bipartisan effort. In fact, it has taken Congress a lot of increases over the President's requests over the last 5 years in order to get to that 40 percent increase. But what that fact does not paint a true picture of is that during that time period there has been an increase in the number of veterans needing VA health care of 31 percent.

So that means over the last 5 years, including during a time of war, we have only had a 9 percent increase in VA health care spending to cover all of the inflationary cost for that health care. And we all know health care budgets, whether they are within the VA or the private system, are going up at 5, 6, 7, 8 percent a year.

Let us look at the inflationary costs in the VA health care that, frankly, make the Obey amendment very critical in trying to improve health care for our veterans. First is just a mandated 2.3 percent salary increase, which is the minimum increase we probably will pass this year, will take \$247 million out of the VA health care budget. For prescription drugs, last year alone prescription drugs in the VA went up \$548 million. So that is nearly \$800 million we are talking about in inflationary costs.

The fact is that this year, according to the Bush administration, we will expect a net increase of 300,000 veterans needing VA health care services. Many of those, tens of thousands of those, would be veterans of the Iraqi and Afghanistan war. Using the administration's own numbers, a little over \$6,400 per veteran per year for VA health care times 300,000 veterans, that alone would require a \$1.94 billion increase in VA health care funding for fiscal year 2006 just to meet inflationary costs and the increase in the number of veterans needing that care.

□ 1100

The fact is, and I think we all know this, we can talk statistics and percentages, that VA hospitals today all over the country are using capital equipment and other equipment budgets just to keep the lights on and to pay salaries. We all know, as Members of Congress who visit our VA hospitals back home, they are underfunded and are having to cut corners, which should not have to be cut, especially during a time of war.

Through all this debate we might forget what the Obey amendment does. It prevents a \$500 million cut in medical administration for VA care. It prevents a \$417 million cut in dollars needed to keep the lights on and run our VA hospitals. It prevents a cut in VA health care research dollars. That is what this amendment is all about, not a partisan debate.

Let us vote against this rule, vote against the previous question, and allow the veterans of America during a time of war to have the right for Congress to vote on increasing our commitment to quality care for our veterans.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this rule.

I, too, am pleased with the establishment of the Subcommittee on Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies. This is an important new development to be able to look holistically at the needs of our military.

I also appreciate the great leadership that this subcommittee has with the gentleman from New York (Chairman Walsh) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS). These are people who have proven their commitments to our veterans and who understand the intricacies of the appropriations process, are willing to get into the details and work hard. I commend their leadership, and look forward to ultimately supporting this bill today.

I certainly support the open rule that has been granted, as is customary for an appropriations bill, particularly because it will allow for the first time in at least 10 years, and perhaps longer, for us to have a specific vote on the opportunity to have money dedicated to the cleanup of unexploded ordnance and military pollution.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the great hidden issues surrounding military quality of life. Unexploded ordnance and military toxins pollute an area we anticipate is larger than the States of Maryland and Massachusetts combined. Let me repeat that. We face military pollution of over 200 years of military activity in this country that is suspected to pollute an area larger than the combined States of Maryland and Massachusetts.

This is an area that is taking billions of dollars, we do not know how much, frankly, and we are on a path, given the current patterns of expenditure, that it will take not dozens of years, not decades, but it could take centuries to clean up.

Now, military quality of life is threatened by exposure to unexploded ordnance and military toxins. My good friend from Massachusetts knows well the problem with the Massachusetts Military Reservation, where groundwater contamination is threatening the water supply of Martha's Vineyard, and there were 8,000 shells that have been discovered already, some within half a mile of an elementary school. We have the opportunity under this bill to be able to dedicate funds to meaningfully accelerate the cleanup.

I am shocked as a Member of Congress that we are talking about the

fifth round of base closures, the fifth round of base closures, threatening upset for communities across the country and job loss, and we have not yet cleaned up bases that were closed in the 1988 round.

I will be offering amendments to remedy this situation and deal with the unexploded ordnance and the military toxins. I would suggest that this is an opportunity that will not only protect the people in these communities that lost military facilities and were not cleaned up, but it will accelerate the development of technology that will save lives for our military around the world. Because the sooner we can figure out whether it is a hubcap or a shell that is buried, it is not just going to make a difference in Massachusetts or in Georgia, where you have unexploded ordnance, or in my State, but it will make a difference in Iraq, Afghanistan and for innocent people that are dying in former battlefields every day around the world.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY), a Member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, let me support strongly this bill which supports our veterans who have served this country so incredibly well. We are a nation of freedom because of the hard work and sacrifice of veterans everywhere, and every day of my life I think of my father and others who have served this great country with distinction.

We are a free nation, and we are winning the battles because of the bravery of our active duty Reservists. But it is the veteran who has brought honor to the flag behind the Speaker's well, and it is the veteran who has made it possible for us to be the free and proud Nation we are.

Today, at 12:45, I will go to the Board of Veterans Appeals on a case that is vitally important to a person in my district, and that is Almon Scott. I have never personally gone to the Board of Appeals level for any veteran personally. My staff has worked tirelessly, Diana Robins in my district, fighting for veterans. But this is a unique case.

Almon Scott served this Nation during Vietnam. He was asked to guard a base where we believe there were potential radioactive materials. Almon Scott is dying now of cancer, a cancer largely linked with radioactive material.

Almon Scott has been shunted aside, if you will, by a system that suggests somehow his ailments are not related to his tour of duty. Unfortunately, he is not entitled to his records, they have been sealed, so Mr. Scott cannot even prove his case, which is why I have taken this extraordinary opportunity to testify on his behalf. He is in Stuart, Florida, today and cannot travel because of his illness. His illness is serious, and it is possibly close, from what I understand, to the end of his life.

What we are hoping to do today is to give Al Scott justice. We are hoping that they recognize his valiant efforts at service, and that the final measure of devotion to this Nation is, he did what he was told. Now they will not tell him what he was guarding.

Subsequent facts have indicated there may have been nuclear or other kinds of biological-type weaponry stored at the site he was requested to guard. At the end of his tour of duty he was told to go home and remain silent about what he did at that time. He honored that contract with America. Now I am hoping today, as I approach the Board of Veterans Appeal not as a lawyer, not as a Congressman, but as a fellow American, that Almon Scott's plea for justice will be heard, and that those hearing his appeal will look at his case specifically and recognize that the right thing to do for this veteran, this proud American, this Marine, is to stand by that same commitment he gave this Nation, that same devotion and that same dedication.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill is inadequate to meet the health care needs of our veterans, plain and simple. Every veterans group in America has recognized that fact. They have all written to all of us. So we can spin this all we want, that somehow this is this incredible bill that is going to take care of all the health care needs of our veterans, but the bottom line is, it is better than what the President requested, but it is not enough. And we have an opportunity to fix it.

To the gentleman from California who earlier questioned my patriotism and pointed out I did not serve in the military, let me say to him that I am in awe of those men and women who have served in our military. I am grateful for what they have done.

I have two children, and there is not a day that I do not wake up and thank God they live in the freest country in the world. And it is precisely because of the veterans who have served our country over the years that they have that privilege. And it is precisely because of my gratitude to the men and women who serve in our military that I feel so passionately about making sure that we do the right thing here today and we adequately fund our veterans' health care budget.

That is what this debate is all about, and that is whether you are a Republican or Democrat, liberal or conservative. I would like to think we could come together on this one issue and make sure that the veterans get what they deserve and have earned. We are at war, and yet, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) pointed out earlier and as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) pointed out, we are not making any sacrifices.

What the Obey amendment would do is simply shave a little bit off of the tax cuts that millionaires are getting and put it towards the veterans budget to make sure we get what we need.

Mr. Speaker, I will be asking Members to vote "no" on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will amend the rule so we can consider the Obey amendment that was rejected in the Committee on Rules last night on a straight party line vote.

Mr. Speaker, the Obey amendment would add an additional \$2.6 billion for VA health care and pay for it by slightly reducing the size of the tax cut for those persons who make more than \$1 million a year. Instead of receiving a tax cut of \$140,000, they would get \$129,000, a reduction of \$11,000 for millionaires. I will tell you that I cannot believe anybody in this country would object to that. I think if you did a poll right now, overwhelmingly the American people would say, that makes sense in this time of war. I am sure that the Donald Trumps and the Bill Gates of this country could afford to reduce their tax cut by \$11,000 so that our troops can have the best health care possible when they return from Iraq and Afghanistan.

This amendment will correct one of most serious shortfalls in this bill, quality health care for our Nation's veterans. It is absolutely critical that this funding be increased to meet the growing needs of our country's veterans.

This Nation made a promise to those serving in the military that they would receive quality health care in return for their valiant service to this country, and now that wounded soldiers are returning to their homes, they deserve the best medical treatment and care available.

We can fix this today. We can fix this today if we allow the Obey amendment to be considered on the floor. But the only way that will happen is if we defeat the previous question.

I want to assure my colleagues that a "no" vote will not prevent us from considering the military quality of life-VA appropriations bill under an open rule, but a "no" vote will allow Members to vote on the Obey amendment. However, a "yes" vote will block consideration of this amendment to help our Nation's soldiers and our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I am in awe of our Nation's veterans. A few hours from now, Members of this body will get on planes and go to their districts and prepare to attend various Memorial Day events throughout the country, and I know all of us will pay tribute to our veterans. We will thank them, we will pay tribute by using the most wonderful words that we can express to be able to say "thank you" adequately.

But, Mr. Speaker, words are not enough. We have enough words in this House. They are not enough. Yesterday, the Republican majority turned their backs on so many veterans by defeating the motion by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) to provide more health care benefits to our members of the Guard and Reserve. It was shameful. But today you have a

chance to redeem yourself. Today, you have a chance to stand up and do the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, we need to support our veterans. We need to make sure they have what they need. We need to support them not just with words, but with action.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

□ 1115

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise again in support of this rule and in recognition of its importance to the men and women who have and who continue to serve and protect America.

Mr. Speaker, our service men and women sacrifice so much for the safety and security of this Nation, and we have the responsibility to ensure that they have everything that they need, not only to succeed in their duties, but also to enjoy the quality of life that they deserve.

This bill represents the culmination of a lot of hard work and a lot of cooperation to not only completely support our service men and women but to also do so in the most helpful and fiscally responsible way. With a total amount of \$121.8 billion, this bill includes an overall increase of \$5.8 billion in discretionary spending from last year. Specifically, the Department of Veterans Affairs will receive \$2.3 billion more than the previous year. The VA medical care increase from 2005 to 2006, I gave the number earlier for the previous 5 years, another 8.5 percent increase. They will receive, they the VA medical services, an increase of \$1.6 billion. And again, I emphasize that there will be no new fees for either veterans medical services or for prescription drugs.

Today represent a victory for our service men and women in all stages of service from recruitment to retirement. And I appreciate all of my colleagues who have spoken on behalf of the rule and in support of the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would again like to thank the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH); the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS); and the chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), for leading the way and ensuring the necessary funds to provide for the quality of life of our service men and women.

I want to encourage my colleagues to support both this rule and the underlying bill for the sake of those who spend their lives defending ours.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the previous ques-

tion on H. Res. 298, the rule providing for the Military Quality of Life Appropriations Bill for FY06.

Memorial Day will soon be here, and members of this body will head home to join Americans all across the country in celebrating those who serve, and have served, our Nation. These brave men and women undeniably deserve our praise and enduring gratitude for all they have done to defend our nation and secure our freedom. While grateful words and thoughtful recognition is right and necessary, it is incumbent on us in this Congress to ensure that words are met with action.

Over 1 million of our active-duty and reserve soldiers have served to date in Iraq and Afghanistan. These men and women—like their predecessors before them—were promised a life time of health care in return for their service to our country. However, as these young soldiers return home, they find that this promise has not been kept by this Congress or the current Administration.

Today, more than 50,000 veterans are waiting in line for at least 6 months for veterans' health care—and that problem will only get worse with the growing numbers of returning soldiers from Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom. As of May 2005, VA had treated only about 85,000 of the 360,675 veterans from these deployments. In 2006, the Department expects to treat 5.2 million veterans—double the number in 1995. And the overall medical care inflation rate for 2003 was close to double the inflation rate.

It is telling that major veteran service organizations call this bill "totally inadequate" and tantamount to veterans being "kicked to the curb." The current proposal before us is no less than \$2.6 billion below the amount needed to maintain current V A services.

The majority is nothing if not consistent, and has once again blocked attempts to fully fund the VA. The Obey amendment, blocked from even being considered on the floor today, would have increased spending on veterans health services by a total of \$2.6 billion over H.R. 2528 This amendment means real improvements to medical services to meet increased demand for mental health services, prosthetics and amputee care, and for priority 8 veterans. It adds \$300 million to upgrade and improve accessibility to VA medical facilities, restoring most of the \$400 million cut in the bill. And it does so by reducing the tax cuts for millionaires by about 8 percent—so instead of a \$140,000 tax cut, the millionaire filer would get \$129,000 tax cut. When compared to all our veterans have fought for and sacrificed, this seems like the least that we can do.

When Americans serve their nation in the military, whether it is the Second World War or the current war in Iraq, this government makes the promise of a lifetime of guaranteed healthcare. It is outrageous that after all the lip service and rhetoric paid to American veterans, the Republican Majority then turns around and reduces funding for their healthcare. It is long past time that Congress match rhetoric with real action to ensure veterans receive the level of service they were promised.

As my good friend Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi said last night on this floor, our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines have been there for us. Now it is our turn to be there for them. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous

question and finally give our veterans the health care system they deserve.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION STATEMENT ON H. RES. 298—RULE FOR H.R. 2528 FY06 MILITARY QUALITY OF LIFE—VA APPROPRIATIONS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment printed in section 3 shall be in order without intervention of any point of order and before any other amendment if offered by Representative Obey of Wisconsin or a designee. The amendment is not subject to amendment except for pro forma amendments or to a demand for a division of the question in the committee of the whole or in the House.

SEC. 3. The amendment referred to in section 2 is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO MILITARY QUALITY OF LIFE, VA, APPROPRIATIONS BILL OFFERED BY MR. OBEY OF WISCONSIN

Page 31, line 1, relating to VA compensation and pensions, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$26,000,000)”.

Page 34, line 21, relating to VA medical services, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$1,500,000,000)”.

Page 36, line 9, relating to VA medical administration, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$500,000,000)”.

Page 37, line 1, relating to VA medical facilities, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$300,000,000)”.

Page 37, line 8, relating to VA medical and prosthetic research, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$67,000,000)”.

Page 37, line 20, relating to VA general operating expense, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$11,000,000)”.

Page 39, line 16, relating to major construction projects, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$150,000,000)”.

Page 41, line 11, relating to minor construction projects, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$51,000,000)”.

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

SEC. 409. In the case of taxpayers with an adjusted gross income in excess of \$1,000,000 for taxable year 2006, the amount of tax reduction resulting from the enactment of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 (Public Law 107-16) and the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-27) shall be reduced by 8.125 percent.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the min-

imum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 194, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 223]

YEAS—223

Aderholt	Gibbons	Northup
Akin	Gilchrest	Nunes
Alexander	Gillmor	Nussle
Bachus	Gingrey	Osborne
Baker	Gohmert	Otter
Barrett (SC)	Goode	Oxley
Bartlett (MD)	Goodlatte	Paul
Barton (TX)	Granger	Pearce
Bass	Graves	Pence
Beauprez	Green (WI)	Peterson (PA)
Biggett	Gutknecht	Petri
Bilirakis	Hall	Pickering
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Pitts
Blackburn	Hart	Platts
Blunt	Hayes	Poe
Boehlert	Hayworth	Pombo
Boehner	Hefley	Porter
Bonilla	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Bonner	Herger	Pryce (OH)
Bono	Hobson	Putnam
Boozman	Hoekstra	Radanovich
Boustany	Hossettler	Ramstad
Bradley (NH)	Hulshof	Regula
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Rehberg
Brown (SC)	Inglis (SC)	Reichert
Brown-Waite,	Issa	Renzi
Ginny	Istook	Reynolds
Burgess	Jenkins	Rogers (AL)
Burton (IN)	Jindal	Rogers (KY)
Buyer	Johnson (CT)	Rogers (MI)
Calvert	Johnson (IL)	Rohrabacher
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Cannon	Jones (NC)	Royce
Cantor	Keller	Ryan (WI)
Capito	Kelly	Ryun (KS)
Carter	Kennedy (MN)	Saxton
Castle	King (IA)	Schwarz (MI)
Chabot	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Chocola	Kingston	Sessions
Coble	Kirk	Shadegg
Cole (OK)	Kline	Shaw
Conaway	Knollenberg	Shays
Cox	Kolbe	Sherwood
Crenshaw	Kuhl (NY)	Shimkus
Cubin	LaHood	Shuster
Culberson	Latham	Simmons
Cunningham	LaTourette	Simpson
Davis (KY)	Leach	Smith (NJ)
Davis, Jo Ann	Lewis (CA)	Smith (TX)
Davis, Tom	Lewis (KY)	Sodrel
Deal (GA)	Linder	Souder
DeLay	LoBiondo	Stearns
Dent	Lucas	Sullivan
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lungren, Daniel	Tancredo
E.		Taylor (NC)
Doolittle	Mack	Terry
Drake	Manzullo	Thomas
Dreier	Marchant	Thornberry
Duncan	McCaul (TX)	Tiahrt
Ehlers	McCotter	Tiberi
English (PA)	McCrery	Turner
Everett	McHenry	Upton
Feeney	McHugh	Walden (OR)
Ferguson	McKeon	Walsh
Fitzpatrick (PA)	McMorris	Wamp
Flake	Mica	Weldon (FL)
Foley	Miller (FL)	Weldon (PA)
Forbes	Miller (MI)	Weller
Fortenberry	Miller, Gary	Westmoreland
Fossella	Moran (KS)	Whitfield
Fox	Murphy	Wicker
Franks (AZ)	Musgrave	Wilson (NM)
Galleghy	Myrick	Wilson (SC)
Garrett (NJ)	Neugebauer	Wolf
Gerlach	Ney	Young (AK)

NAYS—194

Abercrombie	Berman	Brown, Corrine
Ackerman	Berry	Butterfield
Allen	Bishop (GA)	Capps
Andrews	Bishop (NY)	Capuano
Baca	Blumenauer	Cardin
Baird	Boren	Cardoza
Baldwin	Boswell	Carnahan
Barrow	Boucher	Carson
Bean	Boyd	Case
Becerra	Brady (PA)	Chandler
Berkley	Brown (OH)	Clay

Cleaver	Kaptur	Rahall
Clyburn	Kennedy (RI)	Rangel
Conyers	Kildee	Reyes
Cooper	Kilpatrick (MI)	Ross
Costa	Kind	Rothman
Costello	Kucinich	Roybal-Allard
Cramer	Langevin	Ruppersberger
Crowley	Lantos	Rush
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Sabo
Davis (AL)	Lee	Salazar
Davis (CA)	Levin	Sanchez, Linda
Davis (FL)	Lewis (GA)	T.
Davis (IL)	Lipinski	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis (TN)	Lofgren, Zoe	Sanders
DeFazio	Lowey	Schakowsky
DeGette	Lynch	Schiff
Delahunt	Maloney	Schwartz (PA)
DeLauro	Markey	Scott (GA)
Dicks	Marshall	Scott (VA)
Dingell	Matheson	Serrano
Doggett	Matsui	Sherman
Edwards	McCarthy	Skelton
Emanuel	McCollum (MN)	Slaughter
Engel	McDermott	Smith (WA)
Eshoo	McGovern	Snyder
Etheridge	McIntyre	Solis
Evans	McNulty	Spratt
Farr	Meehan	Stark
Fattah	Meek (FL)	Strickland
Ford	Meeks (NY)	Stupak
Frank (MA)	Melancon	Tanner
Gonzalez	Michaud	Tauscher
Gordon	Miller (NC)	Taylor (MS)
Green, Al	Miller, George	Thompson (CA)
Green, Gene	Mollohan	Thompson (MS)
Grijalva	Moore (KS)	Tierney
Gutierrez	Moore (WI)	Towns
Harman	Moran (VA)	Udall (CO)
Hastings (FL)	Nadler	Udall (NM)
Higgins	Napolitano	Van Hollen
Hinches	Neal (MA)	Velázquez
Hinojosa	Oberstar	Vislosky
Holden	Obey	Wasserman
Holt	Olver	Schultz
Honda	Ortiz	Waters
Hooley	Owens	Watson
Hoyer	Pallone	Watt
Inslee	Pascrell	Waxman
Israel	Pastor	Weiner
Jackson (IL)	Payne	Wexler
Jackson-Lee	Pelosi	Woolsey
(TX)	Peterson (MN)	Wu
Jefferson	Pomeroy	Wynn
Kanjorski	Price (NC)	

NOT VOTING—16

Doyle	Hyde	Millender-
Emerson	Johnson, E. B.	McDonald
Filner	Jones (OH)	Murtha
Frelinghuysen	McKinney	Norwood
Hastings (WA)	Menendez	Sweeney
Herseth		Young (FL)

□ 1143

Messrs. SERRANO, CHANDLER and POMEROY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. TURNER changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against: Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 223, on H. Res. 298, I was in my Congressional District on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1145

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1449

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my

name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1449.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2528 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

MILITARY QUALITY OF LIFE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 298 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2528.

The Chair designates the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) as chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1147

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2528) making appropriations for military quality of life functions of the Department of Defense, military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, with Mrs. BIGGERT (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

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

Madam Chairman, today I am proud to represent the first Subcommittee on Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies appropriations bill for consideration of the House.

This subcommittee was formed for the purpose of taking a more comprehensive look at the programs related to providing a suitable quality of life for our service men and women, from recruitment through retirement.

I believe the bill before Members today does just that, and it does it in a fiscally responsible way.

Since the advent of the All-Volunteer Force in 1973, quality of life has come to play an increasingly important role. In the short time between the subcommittee's organization and today, I have met with many officials from the Department of Defense who are energized and excited with the makeup of this new subcommittee. Everyone we met said the same thing, you recruit the soldier, but you retain "the family"; and this new bill structure will make a significant contribution to that goal.

I have also met with many people on the issues related to the Defense Health Program and the VA. Again, there is excitement about the synergies that currently exist and the ones that can be developed or enhanced between DOD and VA. This bill makes all that possible.

I salute the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) for having the foresight and persistence to bring about this positive change.

The bill before us today totals \$121.8 billion, of which \$85.2 billion is discretionary spending and \$36.6 billion is mandatory spending. On the discretionary side, the bill is \$1.1 billion above the President's request and \$5.9 billion above last year's bill. The bill funds the VA at \$68.1 billion, \$2.3 billion above fiscal year 2005, and \$635 million above the budget request. Included in this amount is \$21 billion for medical services, a \$1.6 billion increase above the 2005 enacted level, and \$1 billion above the budget request. This is an 8.5 percent increase over last year. I would also note that with the funding in this bill, the medical services account will grow by 18.2 percent over the past 2 years.

Also, this funding level does not assume adoption of any new fees, nor does it preclude the committee of jurisdiction from moving on such legislation. The VA funding level, among other things, restores funding for long-term care to the level it was in the fiscal year 2005 appropriation, and we direct the Secretary to work with the National Association of State Veterans Homes to come to some agreeable policy to make the program work better for veterans and the taxpayers.

The bill also includes language directing the Department to spend not less than \$2.2 billion on specialty mental health care in fiscal year 2006, in direct concern to many Members of Congress that the VA needs to make this a priority. We have never specified funding for a category of care in this bill in the past.

We have also included report language directing the Department to more than double the funding available for mental health research. For the Department of Defense, the bill provides \$53.5 billion. Within this total is funding for military construction, family housing construction and maintenance,

costs associated with BRAC for the prior rounds and the current round, basic allowance for housing payments, facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization, and environmental restoration.

Regarding BRAC, let me just repeat what we have said in subcommittee. As of now, we consider the Secretary of Defense's recommendations just that, recommendations only. We will be following the commission process, but we see no need to make changes to the military construction budget at this time. Also included in this total is \$20 billion for the Defense Health Program, an increase of \$1.8 billion above fiscal year 2005 and \$192 million above the budget request. This amount supports troop readiness by making sure we have an adequate funding level to prepare our soldiers, sailors, and airmen for training and deployments while caring for their families and dependents.

One last thing I wanted to mention is the joint DOD-VA incentives program which was authorized in fiscal year 2003 and has been appropriated since that time. This program creates a fund which creates the opportunity for the DOD and VA to explore joint ventures in research and information technology that establishes and enhances continuity between these two Departments and contributes to the synergies we all want.

We have a responsibility to make sure that the limited resources we have are spent efficiently and effectively and that programs achieve their mission. The structure of this bill provides us with an opportunity to take a bold look across programs and Departments and find synergies and efficiencies. Change is not always easy to go through, and it does not happen overnight; but we have taken the first step towards producing a more focused bill, and I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) for his vision and support.

Lastly, I would like to express my gratitude to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), the ranking member of the subcommittee. We have developed a strong working relationship based upon trust. He has a wealth of experience with the military, given his long association with Fort Hood, Texas. He has been very generous with his time and his counsel as we assembled this bill, and it is much appreciated.

Thanks to my subcommittee members for their active participation in the hearing process and also for their advice, and also to our very professional staff led by the capable Carol Murphy, and to my personal staff for their help in preparing this work product. I am very grateful to all of them. This would not have been possible without their help.

MILITARY QUALITY OF LIFE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 2006 (H.R. 2528)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE					
Military construction, Army.....	1,981,084	1,479,841	1,652,552	-328,532	+172,711
Rescissions.....	-18,976	---	---	+18,976	---
Total.....	1,962,108	1,479,841	1,652,552	-309,556	+172,711
Military construction, Navy and Marine Corps.....	1,069,947	1,029,249	1,109,177	+39,230	+79,928
Rescissions.....	-24,000	---	---	+24,000	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324).....	138,800	---	---	-138,800	---
Additional appropriations (Div. J) (P.L. 108-447).....	-4,350	---	---	+4,350	---
Total.....	1,180,397	1,029,249	1,109,177	-71,220	+79,928
Military construction, Air Force.....	866,331	1,069,640	1,171,338	+305,007	+101,698
Rescission.....	-21,800	---	---	+21,800	---
Total.....	844,531	1,069,640	1,171,338	+326,807	+101,698
Military construction, Defense-wide.....	686,055	1,042,730	976,664	+290,609	-66,066
Rescission.....	-22,737	---	---	+22,737	---
Total.....	663,318	1,042,730	976,664	+313,346	-66,066
Total, Active components.....	4,650,354	4,621,460	4,909,731	+259,377	+288,271
Military construction, Army National Guard.....	446,748	327,012	410,624	-36,124	+83,612
Military construction, Air National Guard.....	243,043	165,256	225,727	-17,316	+60,471
Rescission.....	-5,000	---	---	+5,000	---
Total.....	238,043	165,256	225,727	-12,316	+60,471
Military construction, Army Reserve.....	92,377	106,077	138,425	+46,048	+32,348
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324).....	8,700	---	---	-8,700	---
Total.....	101,077	106,077	138,425	+37,348	+32,348
Military construction, Naval Reserve.....	44,246	45,226	45,226	+980	---
Additional appropriations (Div. J) (P.L. 108-447).....	4,350	---	---	-4,350	---
Total.....	48,596	45,226	45,226	-3,370	---
Military construction, Air Force Reserve.....	123,977	79,260	110,847	-13,130	+31,587
Total, Reserve components.....	958,441	722,831	930,849	-27,592	+208,018
Total, Military construction.....	5,608,795	5,344,291	5,840,580	+231,785	+496,289
Appropriations.....	(5,553,808)	(5,344,291)	(5,840,580)	(+286,772)	(+496,289)
Emergency appropriations.....	(147,500)	---	---	(-147,500)	---
Rescissions.....	(-92,513)	---	---	(+92,513)	---
North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program.....	165,800	206,858	206,858	+41,058	---
Rescission.....	-5,000	---	---	+5,000	---
Total.....	160,800	206,858	206,858	+46,058	---
Family housing construction, Army.....	636,099	549,636	549,636	-86,463	---
Rescission.....	-21,000	---	---	+21,000	---
Total.....	615,099	549,636	549,636	-65,463	---
Family housing operation and maintenance, Army.....	926,507	812,993	803,993	-122,514	-9,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324).....	1,200	---	---	-1,200	---
Total.....	927,707	812,993	803,993	-123,714	-9,000

MILITARY QUALITY OF LIFE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 2006 (H.R. 2528)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Family housing construction, Navy and Marine Corps....	139,107	218,942	218,942	+79,835	---
Rescission.....	-12,301	---	---	+12,301	---
Total.....	126,806	218,942	218,942	+92,136	---
Family housing operation and maintenance, Navy and Marine Corps.....	696,304	593,660	588,660	-107,644	-5,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324).....	9,100	---	---	-9,100	---
Total.....	705,404	593,660	588,660	-116,744	-5,000
Family housing construction, Air Force.....	846,959	1,251,108	1,236,220	+389,261	-14,888
Rescission.....	-45,171	---	---	+45,171	---
Total.....	801,788	1,251,108	1,236,220	+434,432	-14,888
Family housing operation and maintenance, Air Force... Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324).....	853,384 11,400	766,939 ---	755,319 ---	-98,065 -11,400	-11,620 ---
Total.....	864,784	766,939	755,319	-109,465	-11,620
Family housing construction, Defense-wide.....	49	---	---	-49	---
Family housing operation and maintenance, Defense-wide	49,575	46,391	46,391	-3,184	---
Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund.....	2,500	2,500	2,500	---	---
Rescission.....	-19,109	---	---	+19,109	---
Total.....	-16,609	2,500	2,500	+19,109	---
Total, Family housing.....	4,074,603	4,242,169	4,201,661	+127,058	-40,508
Appropriations.....	(4,150,484)	(4,242,169)	(4,201,661)	(+51,177)	(-40,508)
Emergency appropriations.....	(21,700)	---	---	(-21,700)	---
Rescissions.....	(-97,581)	---	---	(+97,581)	---
Chemical demilitarization construction, Defense-wide..	81,886	---	---	-81,886	---
Base realignment and closure:					
Base realignment and closure account, 1990.....	246,116	377,827	377,827	+131,711	---
Base realignment and closure account, 2005.....	---	1,880,466	1,570,466	+1,570,466	-310,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324).....	50	---	---	-50	---
Total, Base realignment and closure.....	246,166	2,258,293	1,948,293	+1,702,127	-310,000
Basic Allowance for Housing:					
Army.....	3,341,882	3,945,392	3,945,392	+603,510	---
Navy.....	3,471,251	3,592,905	3,592,905	+121,654	---
Marine Corps.....	1,053,573	1,179,071	1,179,071	+125,498	---
Air Force.....	3,010,770	3,240,113	3,240,113	+229,343	---
Army National Guard.....	434,073	453,690	453,690	+19,617	---
Air National Guard.....	214,151	248,317	248,317	+34,166	---
Army Reserve.....	290,117	310,566	310,566	+20,449	---
Naval Reserve.....	202,282	191,338	191,338	-10,944	---
Marine Corps Reserve.....	38,945	40,609	40,609	+1,664	---
Air Force Reserve.....	59,781	71,286	71,286	+11,505	---
Total, Basic Allowance for Housing.....	12,116,825	13,273,287	13,273,287	+1,156,462	---
Facilities Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization:					
Army.....	1,967,028	1,825,518	1,850,518	-116,510	+25,000
Navy.....	1,333,288	1,344,971	1,344,971	+11,683	---
Marine Corps.....	523,756	553,960	553,960	+30,204	---
Air Force.....	1,991,710	1,815,701	1,845,701	-146,009	+30,000
Defense-Wide.....	95,000	115,400	115,400	+20,400	---
Army National Guard.....	384,044	391,544	391,544	+7,500	---
Air National Guard.....	230,642	169,791	184,791	-45,851	+15,000
Army Reserve.....	201,141	204,370	204,370	+3,229	---
Naval Reserve.....	73,410	62,788	67,788	-5,622	+5,000
Marine Corps Reserve.....	12,126	10,105	10,105	-2,021	---

MILITARY QUALITY OF LIFE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 2006 (H.R. 2528)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Air Force Reserve.....	53,056	55,764	55,764	+2,708	---
Total, Facilities Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization.....	6,865,201	6,549,912	6,624,912	-240,289	+75,000
Environmental Restoration:					
Army.....	400,948	407,865	407,865	+6,917	---
Navy.....	266,820	305,275	305,275	+38,455	---
Air Force.....	397,368	406,461	406,461	+9,093	---
Defense-Wide.....	23,684	28,167	28,167	+4,483	---
Formerly used Defense sites.....	266,516	221,921	221,921	-44,595	---
Total, Environmental Restoration.....	1,355,336	1,369,689	1,369,689	+14,353	---
Defense Health Program:					
Operation and maintenance.....	17,297,419	19,247,137	19,184,537	+1,887,118	-62,600
Procurement.....	367,035	375,319	355,119	-11,916	-20,200
Research and development.....	506,982	169,156	444,256	-62,726	+275,100
Total, Defense Health Program.....	18,171,436	19,791,612	19,983,912	+1,812,476	+192,300
General provision (sec. 128).....	---	65,000	65,000	+65,000	---
Total, title I:					
New budget (obligational) authority.....	48,681,048	53,101,111	53,514,192	+4,833,144	+413,081
Appropriations.....	(48,706,892)	(53,101,111)	(53,514,192)	(+4,807,300)	(+413,081)
Emergency appropriations.....	(169,250)	---	---	(-169,250)	---
Rescissions.....	(-195,094)	---	---	(+195,094)	---
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS					
Veterans Benefits Administration					
Compensation and pensions.....	32,607,688	33,412,879	33,412,879	+805,191	---
Readjustment benefits.....	2,556,232	3,214,246	3,214,246	+658,014	---
Veterans insurance and indemnities.....	44,380	45,907	45,907	+1,527	---
Veterans housing benefit program fund program account (indefinite).....	43,784	64,586	64,586	+20,802	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(500)	(500)	(500)	---	---
Credit subsidy.....	-144,000	-112,000	-112,000	+32,000	---
Administrative expenses.....	152,842	153,575	153,575	+733	---
Vocational rehabilitation loans program account.....	47	53	53	+6	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(4,108)	(4,242)	(4,242)	(+134)	---
Administrative expenses.....	309	305	305	-4	---
Native American veteran housing loan program account..	566	580	580	+14	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(50,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)	(-20,000)	---
Total, Veterans Benefits Administration.....	35,261,848	36,780,131	36,780,131	+1,518,283	---
Veterans Health Administration					
Medical services.....	19,316,995	19,995,141	20,995,141	+1,678,146	+1,000,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L.108-324).....	38,283	---	---	-38,283	---
Medical administration.....	4,667,360	4,517,874	4,134,874	-532,486	-383,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L.108-324).....	1,940	---	---	-1,940	---
Medical facilities.....	3,715,040	3,297,669	3,297,669	-417,371	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L.108-324).....	46,909	---	---	-46,909	---
Medical and prosthetic research.....	402,348	393,000	393,000	-9,348	---
Medical care cost recovery collections:					
Offsetting collections.....	-1,985,984	-2,170,000	-2,170,000	-184,016	---
Appropriations (indefinite).....	1,985,984	2,170,000	2,170,000	+184,016	---
Total, Veterans Health Administration.....	28,188,875	28,203,684	28,820,684	+631,809	+617,000
Departmental Administration					
General operating expenses.....	1,314,155	1,418,827	1,411,827	+97,672	-7,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L.108-324).....	545	---	---	-545	---
National Cemetery Administration.....	147,734	156,447	156,447	+8,713	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L.108-324).....	50	---	---	-50	---
Office of Inspector General.....	69,153	70,174	70,174	+1,021	---

MILITARY QUALITY OF LIFE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 2006 (H.R. 2528)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Construction, major projects.....	455,130	607,100	607,100	+151,970	---
Construction, minor projects.....	228,933	208,937	208,937	-19,996	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L.108-324).....	36,343	---	---	-36,343	---
Grants for construction of State extended care facilities.....	104,322	---	25,000	-79,322	+25,000
Grants for the construction of State veterans cemeteries.....	31,744	32,000	32,000	+256	---
Total, Departmental Administration.....	2,388,109	2,493,485	2,511,485	+123,376	+18,000
=====					
Total, title II:					
New budget (obligational) authority.....	65,838,832	67,477,300	68,112,300	+2,273,468	+635,000
Appropriations.....	(65,714,762)	(67,477,300)	(68,112,300)	(+2,397,538)	(+635,000)
Emergency appropriations.....	(124,070)	---	---	(-124,070)	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(54,608)	(34,742)	(34,742)	(-19,866)	---
=====					
Discretionary.....	30,730,748	30,851,682	31,486,682	+755,934	+635,000
Mandatory.....	35,108,084	36,625,618	36,625,618	+1,517,534	---
=====					
TITLE III - RELATED AGENCIES					
American Battle Monuments Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	40,771	35,250	35,750	-5,021	+500
Foreign currency fluctuations.....	11,904	15,250	15,250	+3,346	---
Total, American Battle Monuments Commission.....	52,675	50,500	51,000	-1,675	+500
U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims					
Salaries and expenses.....	17,112	18,295	18,295	+1,183	---
Department of Defense - Civil					
Cemeterial Expenses, Army					
Salaries and expenses.....	29,363	28,050	29,550	+187	+1,500
Armed Forces Retirement Home					
Operation and maintenance.....	57,163	57,033	57,033	-130	---
Capital program.....	3,968	1,248	1,248	-2,720	---
Total, Armed Forces Retirement Home.....	61,131	58,281	58,281	-2,850	---
=====					
Total, title III:					
New budget (obligational) authority.....	160,281	155,126	157,126	-3,155	+2,000
=====					
Grand total, all titles:					
New budget (obligational) authority.....	114,680,161	120,733,537	121,783,618	+7,103,457	+1,050,081
Appropriations.....	(114,581,935)	(120,733,537)	(121,783,618)	(+7,201,683)	(+1,050,081)
Emergency appropriations.....	(293,320)	---	---	(-293,320)	---
Rescissions.....	(-195,094)	---	---	(+195,094)	---
=====					

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Chairman, I first want to salute the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) for his professional, thorough, and fair-minded leadership in crafting this bill, which I support.

Throughout this entire process, every step of the way, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) focused on doing one thing: asking what is best for our service men and women and veterans, and for that he has my deep respect.

I would like to offer my observations on this important bill from the perspective of someone who had the privilege of representing over 40,000 Army soldiers who served our country in Iraq. For 14 years I represented Fort Hood, Texas, an Army installation which is now very ably represented by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER).

I have seen firsthand, like so many Members of Congress here, the sacrifices made by our troops and their families in time of war and peace: time away from children and loved ones, combat injuries, both mental and physical, and I have seen widows in their 20s holding babies in their arms that will never know their fathers because they gave the ultimate sacrifice to our Nation in combat.

I believe, as other Members do, that we have a solemn, moral obligation to support our troops, their families, military retirees, and veterans. They have kept their promise to our Nation, and now we should keep our promise to them. That is why I consider it a privilege to serve on the first Subcommittee on Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs with the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

My respect for our service men and women and veterans is also why I voted against the House budget resolution earlier this year and against the 302(b) allocation that determined how many dollars our subcommittee would have today to allocate to spend on DOD health, military construction and VA programs, including VA health and research programs.

I believe, especially during a time of war, Congress should make greater investments in health care and military construction programs that are vital to the training and well-being of our troops and their families. I believe we should invest significantly more in VA health care for our veterans. And despite dollar increases, and they have been real and they have been significant over the last 5 years for VA health care, our VA hospitals are facing serious budget challenges due to two things: one, high health care inflation that is affecting all hospitals, whether they be VA or in the private sector; and secondly, because the average annual increase in the number of veterans needing VA health care has been about 250,000 to 300,000 veterans.

Having said that, our appropriations subcommittee did not have the power to determine how much money we had to spend on programs under our jurisdiction. That was largely decided by the budget resolution. I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS). Given the FY 2006 budget resolution, the gentleman worked hard to get an increased allocation for this subcommittee.

Given what I consider to have been tough choices, I believe the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and our subcommittee worked hard and we have worked in good faith on a bipartisan basis to put limited dollars where they are most needed: veterans and DOD medical services and housing for military troops and their families. We went the extra mile, along with professional staff on both sides of the aisle, to scrub the budget to put dollars in the highest priority areas. That was our responsibility, and I think we did it well.

I believe there are a number of very important positive steps taken in this bill. First, VA medical services were increased by \$1 billion over the President's request, a request which I thought, frankly, was inadequate. The bottom line is we are allocating \$1.6 billion over last year's VA medical services. I believe the VA needs more to keep up with medical inflation and an expected increase of 300,000 veterans. But given our allocation, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), in particular, fought very hard to make VA medical services funding our top priority; and I stand with him in that priority. I think it is the right choice.

Second, it is positive that DOD health care was increased by 10 percent. During a time of war, that is important.

Third, base allowance for housing was increased by 9.5 percent. Our troops deserve improved housing.

□ 1200

Let me also add that this committee, under Chairman WALSH and its bipartisan committee membership, has continued the very important role in leading what I consider to be the most important family housing improvement program in our military history, that is, the public-private partnership that is building tens of thousands of new homes to deserving men and women and their families serving in our military.

I salute the subcommittee's leadership on that important program.

Fourth, the subcommittee rejected the Administration's request to more than double prescription copays for veterans and to add a new \$250 annual enrollment fee for some veterans. In addition, in my viewpoint, the committee wisely rejected massive proposed cuts in veterans' nursing home care. The committee's work in this area will mean tens of thousands of veterans will get long-term nursing

care that otherwise might have been deprived of that care.

A fifth good thing that this committee did in its work is, it directed the VA to focus more of its medical care and research dollars on mental health care, an essential priority given our wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as the mental health care needs of veterans from past wars. I particularly salute the gentleman from New York for his leadership in this much-needed initiative. I, for one, believe it will be one of the important legacies of his service in Congress.

The VA has underfunded mental health care services and research for too long and that is going to change because of the leadership of this committee.

While I wish we did not have to cut VA medical facilities operations by \$400 million and VA health administration programs and DOD health care research and cut, \$9 million out of VA health care research, I believe the committee put the limited dollars where they were most needed, in funding VA and DOD health care during a time of war.

I also wish we were not at the point where we were still funding military construction at levels below levels spent before the Iraqi war began, but this bill moves us in a positive direction, increasing military construction by 4 percent.

Given a smaller budget than I would have preferred, the bottom line is that I believe the subcommittee, led by its chairman, made solid decisions on a bipartisan basis to scour the budget and to fund our highest-priority needs. We stopped harmful cuts to VA nursing home care and took important new steps to ensure that mental health care services for our troops and our veterans will be improved. That is why I intend to support this bill and ask my colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, to do the same.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALSH. Madam Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER).

(Mr. MILLER of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2528—The Military Quality of Life and Veterans' Affairs Appropriations Act for Fiscal year 2006. Let me begin by commending the gentleman from New York, Mr. WALSH, for his work on this important bill.

I'd like to comment briefly on an issue that is important to me as the Chairman of the Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs Subcommittee on the Veterans' Affairs Committee—the National Shrine Commitment. As you may know, pursuant to Public Law 106-117 the Department of Veterans Affairs entered into a contract to assess the state of VA's national cemeteries. That study identified

\$279 million of needed repairs and maintenance. While the President requested \$14.4 million to fund this initiative, the Veterans' Affairs Committee, in its views and estimates letter to the Budget Committee, recommended an additional \$45.6 million in minor construction funding to begin a 5-year plan to fully fund needed repairs and maintenance.

It is necessary that Congress ensure our national cemeteries are maintained in a manner that pays proper tribute to our fallen veterans. Funding the National Shrine Commitment achieves that end. I look forward to working with Chairman WALSH to see if we can find the necessary resources to fund the National Shrine Commitment.

Mr. WALSH. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2528, a bill which will provide the essential funding that our Nation's heroes, our veterans, need. I applaud the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from the 25th District of New York (Mr. WALSH) for their vision and leadership on this important issue, and I also thank them for allowing me the time to speak on a bill that is so important to our country.

This bill increases overall veterans' benefits to \$21 billion which is nearly \$1.6 billion more than last year's funding level for our veterans.

Madam Chairman, over the last 2 years alone, this Congress has increased funding for veterans' medical care by 18 percent. In addition, H.R. 2528 doubles veterans' mental health research funding and requires a comprehensive study on post-traumatic stress disorder. As a veteran of our Armed Forces, I understand that this is an issue that our future veterans, who are currently fighting in the war on terror, will most certainly struggle with. I applaud the efforts that this bill makes to ensure America's veterans will receive the mental health care they need when they return home as our heroes.

Madam Chairman, I also support this bill because of the assistance it will provide to the veterans in my home State of Nevada. H.R. 2528 provides \$199 million for a new veterans hospital in Las Vegas. Las Vegas is the fastest-growing metropolitan area in our Nation. Nevada's veteran population is simply exploding. This new hospital will ensure that those who have bravely served our country have access to all their health care needs. This is great news for Nevada's veterans.

The committee's report that accompanies H.R. 2528 also ensures that the vital per diem payments that the VA provides to our State veterans home in Boulder City will not be cut. This report language also requests Secretary Nicholson to engage in a dialogue with our State-operated veterans homes to come up with a solution to increasing the costs of providing quality health care to our veterans.

Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill because it provides our Nation's veterans with the benefits that they have earned by protecting our great Nation.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN).

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

Mr. ROTHMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I rise in support of the Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs Appropriations bill. I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) for their very hard work in drafting this well-balanced bill.

I also want to acknowledge the majority and minority staff for the diligence and dedication that they have demonstrated throughout this process. I can appreciate the tough choices that both the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Texas had to make with this tight allocation. Admittedly, if there were a different majority in the House, there would have been more money allocated to these programs, but within the budget constraints imposed upon the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), I believe they have done a fine job, and I urge all of my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the subcommittee, I want to commend both our chairman and ranking minority member for producing a bill which will dramatically improve the life and the experience of men and women joining the United States Navy and going for basic training and other schools in my district at Great Lakes Naval Training Center.

This bill funds two new barracks for the Great Lakes Naval Training Center and an infrastructure upgrade. It continues a \$1 billion capitalization program which has transformed Great Lakes into the birthplace of the United States Navy.

But this bill does something even more important. Throughout the country, we know that we have several hospital facilities funded by the Department of Defense close to VA facilities also funded by the taxpayer in caring for our veterans. What this bill does is it accelerates plans to build a new joint VA-Navy hospital in North Chicago, Illinois. This new facility, with two reports required by the administration to accelerate the progress, will be the first ever Navy-VA joint facility. We are very proud that that will be located in North Chicago, Illinois. This \$100 million facility will ensure veterans' health care in northern Illinois and

provide cutting-edge, quality care for the recruits who are joining the United States Navy.

For these reasons and others, I really commend the chairman and the staff for what they have done to accelerate this, better health care for veterans, better health care for naval recruits and at lower cost to the taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, am pleased that we have the creation of a Military Quality of Life committee. It is hard to imagine more capable leadership than that that will be offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) and there is tremendous potential to look holistically at the problems and opportunities dealing with military quality of life.

I am particularly pleased because it will give for the first time a true focus to look at what is a serious, hidden issue of military quality of life, and that is military cleanup. For too long, this Congress has been missing in action. It has never given priority to the vast stretches of the United States in every State of the Union, an area the size of the States of Maryland and Massachusetts combined, to deal with the cleanup of past military activities.

It impacts our troops and their families on the bases, their neighbors past and present, and it has significant financial impacts, although if we do this job right, we have the opportunity to dramatically reduce the cost. I am impressed over the last 7 years working on this issue that the military, the men and women in the ranks, want to do this job right. They have sensitivity to the environment and they know that they are in trouble if they are exposed unnecessarily to pollution and unexploded ordnance.

Cleanup gives the military many advantages. There are less hazards to fighting men and women. There will be more area to train. There are better relationships with the surrounding area. Most important, it will develop tools and techniques that will save American lives. It will give the military long-term security with these new techniques and technologies.

Every day people die unnecessarily from land mines and UXO around the world. I am going to offer some amendments because, frankly, as much respect as I have for the new subcommittee and the fact it is new, they are looking at a whole new range of areas.

We are looking at allocating over \$1.5 billion to the 2005 base closure rounds, and we have not yet cleaned up after the very first round of military closures. That is unacceptable. It is time for Congress to no longer be missing in action. We need to step up, provide the guidance, and clean up these areas.

It is unacceptable after 17 years that we will tell the people in Sacramento that their base might be cleaned up in the year 2072. The money is available. The Congress just needs to find the will to allocate it and support the Military Quality of Life Subcommittee in its important work to make sure that we protect military families and the military environment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), a very respected member of the subcommittee.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me this time. I would like to congratulate the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) for a fine job, with limited resources, in producing, I think, a very good work product.

I know that the gentleman from New York shares my concern for our service men and women who are returning from Iraq and Afghanistan with the adverse psychological effects of combat. Many of the difficulties experienced by these brave men and women can be classified as post traumatic stress disorder, or PTSD. As you are aware, the GAO report on VA and defense health care dated September 2004 has highlighted the lack of services at the Department of Defense military treatment facilities and VA hospitals to address the needs of these former and active duty personnel. The report language and various initiatives that you have included in our bill address this problem, and I want to thank you for your leadership.

However, the lack of services available demands that we take immediate steps to increase psychological screening and treatment for our returning troops. PTSD cannot be just a Veterans' Administration problem. The needs of our active duty men and women have to be at the forefront of our agenda, meaning that it is wrong simply to discharge service men and women because we do not have the capacity to treat them while they are on active duty.

Since most of our military hospitals lack the expertise to deal with a large influx of such patients, I would like to urge the chairman, as the bill goes to conference, to consider allowing the creation of regional centers across our country located at private hospitals or available military clinics to help meet these increasing needs.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for raising this issue, and I share his concern.

The gentleman has correctly indicated that this bill works to address PTSD research so that we can better treat mental health symptoms of our active and retired military personnel.

□ 1215

As the gentleman is aware, in this difficult budget climate, we crafted a bill that uses our resources wisely. I commit to the gentleman that I will take his views with great respect as they relate to PTSD into consideration as we move forward toward the conference of this bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman for his consideration and for his leadership, and I thank him for yielding me the time.

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

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Texas for yielding me this time.

I rise in support of this bill because, as a member of the Military Personnel Subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services, I can tell the Members that people are the most precious resource we have in our Armed Forces.

As we get closer to Memorial Day, many of us here in Congress will go home and talk about how important it is to support our troops and our veterans, and that is a fine sentiment, and I agree 100 percent. But what does Congress actually do to follow through? Our obligation to support our troops by no means ends when they separate from their branch of service. Yet in the age of spiraling deficits, some folks in Washington seem all too willing to forget the promises that we have made to our veterans.

The Veterans Administration is chronically underfunded every year, and it is struggling to provide the basic services and benefits that veterans have been promised.

The President's proposed VA budget, for example, would have significantly raised out-of-pocket health care expenses for many veterans. That was his so-called increase, by increasing fees to our veterans. And I am glad that this Committee on Appropriations saw to it that we would not raise the out-of-pocket costs for veterans. That is not the acceptable answer for the VA funding problems. The answer to the funding problem is to adequately fund the VA in the budget so that the veterans will receive the kind of care that they were promised when they signed up to defend our country.

While I am pleased that the Committee on Appropriations saw fit to increase VA funding from the wholly inadequate amount requested by the President, I am very disappointed that the efforts of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), our ranking member, to provide significant additional funding, \$2.6 billion, for our Nation's veterans, financed by reducing the tax cut for the very richest Americans, that all of this was blocked by the Republican majority.

As a member of the Blue Dog Coalition, I readily advocate the importance of fiscal responsibility in government, but let us not do that on the backs of our veterans.

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

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the first order of business is to thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) and to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), ranking member, for a very fine effort on behalf of the Nation's veterans.

We leave today and most Americans will join us on Memorial Day to honor the fallen heroes and, might I say, sheroes. The women of the United States Congress just came back from Arlington Cemetery honoring the fallen women who lost their lives in battle. Again, we restate our commitment for the opportunity for women to be able to serve on the front lines, as they have advocated for and as we have noted that they have offered their lives in battle without any suggestion of taking the back seat.

Today we attempt to pass legislation that speaks to the Nation's veterans; and many of them, all of them, will be joining us on Memorial Day as we honor those who have lost their lives, but we will be with the veterans who were willing to give the ultimate sacrifice.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) so very much and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) for the work that they have done dealing with keeping veterans hospitals opened. I would have hoped, however, that we would have been able to debate the Obey amendment that would have given us \$2.6 billion to really be able to honor and be with our veterans and mourn those who had lost their lives, because let me remind them, when soldiers fall, their families are left behind and we need a strong VA health system.

In fact, I recently, in my representation, had the Veterans Hospital of Houston in my congressional district. I now share it with the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN), but we are all still fighting for our veterans hospitals. And I thank both of them, and I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), for the great fight that they have had.

I see the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) on the floor, and I just want to note the great work done with the Fisher House in years past when we funded a place for veterans' families, families of veterans who are in the hospital, that their families may stay nearby.

We must realize that we have 1,500 dead in Iraq and Afghanistan, maybe

upwards of 2,000, and they are dying every day. But we also have the injured who are coming home who need to have a full open hospital system. Their families need to have it. So it is important, Mr. Chairman, that even as we look at the good work that this committee did, to see the opportunity to be able to debate the Obey amendment because the \$2.6 billion is needed.

I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas about the concerns that I have raised. One, we know the trauma that many of these returning soldiers will face in mental health. That is one of the aspects of service of the veterans hospital. We know the fact that there is a need, even though the CARE Commission is now looking at closing eight hospitals, that we need to keep the hospitals open, and then, of course, we need to protect the families and give them good health care.

I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman that if we were able to add an extra \$2.6 billion, a mere drop in the bucket, to this particular funding, and, by the way, that only gives the rich a \$129,000 tax break versus \$140,000, but would we be able to answer the concerns of America's veterans whom he has heard from around the Nation?

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, let me just say I am proud of the work the subcommittee did on a bipartisan basis to take limited dollars and use them wisely and focus them on high priorities. But, clearly, the reason I supported the Obey amendment and am sorry it was not allowed by the Committee on Rules is because it would allow a significant increase in resources and provide mental health care services and funding for the operations of our hospitals. And I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for her great leadership over the years in standing up and fighting for our men and women who have served our country in uniform.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I will simply thank the gentleman for his comments and say I know that the hospitals are vital to our veterans and I hope that we can continue the fight for them and I look forward to working with him and the chairman.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, my good friend, someone who has worked very closely with us throughout this process.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for the quality of his work, and I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS). We have had the opportunity to work over the years in the Committee on Armed Services, and we continue to work with them.

I came down here to tell them I am proud of them. They put together a

pretty good product. They are operating under new procedures. I am really pleased with regard to the leadership of taking the personnel and housing and coupling it with veterans. I want to work with the gentlemen and the gentlewoman on their committees and their staff because the only way we can get the seamless transition is through working together.

And we are going to end this procurement of I will buy my own systems and VA buys their own systems and then they are incompatible and we have got duplicity and multiplicity and, guess what, it is now up to us to end this.

And we are going to make this seamless transition work. We are going to give the right platforms with regard to IT. I want to thank them for making that cut in IT. A lot of people are going to say, Why did they do that? We are about to set the correct platform under the right form of leadership. And what I would like to work with the gentlemen on is that we are going to hopefully take the chief information officer within the VA and we are going to give them line and budget authority. We are going to end the stovepipes and the wasting of hundreds of millions of dollars, because we need to modernize this system. So I want to work with them as we proceed.

Despite this recent comment about \$1 billion being a drop in the bucket, they plussed-up health care \$1 billion. That is real money. One billion dollars in my congressional district, and I cannot speak for yours, but in my congressional district, I take all of the income tax receipts of my constituents and it is \$990 million. So \$1 billion represents the labor of every constituent who works in my congressional district.

So they work together and plus this up \$1 billion over the President's mark; and as a matter of fact, they exceeded the mark that we gave to the budget views and estimates. So I stand here and congratulate the bipartisan work; 1.64 billion is meaningful, Mr. Chairman.

With regard to their focus on PTSD and following the President's recommendation of the \$100 million, I thank them. We are going to be holding a hearing coming up; so to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) and his concerns, hopefully he can contact us and we can also address his ideas. I am pleased about the COLA adjustment. We are going to move in June to do the authorization on the COLA.

And I also want to pause for a moment and thank them with regard to the second pilot on revenue enhancement. This is boring stuff that a lot of people do not like to talk about, but it is the operations of these health systems. And we are not getting it right at the beginning, and we are not getting coding right. We are not getting the number right even on collections. So we have this project out in the visit in Ohio, and now we are opening up a second front, a competitive pilot. This is going to be the right thing as we

move to improve revenue enhancement.

So I want to thank them, and I want to thank their staff for their fine work. I know I focused my entire remarks on the veterans side, but let me thank them also for what they do for the men and women and the families in taking care of their housing on these bases. It is extremely important and very valued. And they are doing some real grinding, and sometimes it does not get all of the attention, and I know what they are doing on the inside. So on behalf of the men and women in uniform, I thank them and God bless them.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

To respond to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, my mentor and one of the real heroes in this world is former Congressman Olin E. Teague, who once held the position that the gentleman from Indiana (Chairman BUYER) now holds. Mr. Teague was a distinguished combat veteran of World War II, served in Congress 32 years, played a leadership role on writing the modern G.I. bill. And I thank the chairman for his leadership on veterans issues, and I think his point regarding the importance of the Committee on Appropriations and authorizing committee regarding veterans working together is terribly important, and I thank him for bringing that point to the floor of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas, my friend and colleague, for yielding me this time.

I would like to bring to the subcommittee's attention and to all of the Members of the House an issue that falls under the jurisdiction of the Military Quality of Life Subcommittee, and that is the Department of Defense's security standards for buildings. I do not think that these standards really meet the test of scrutiny when applied to cost effectiveness nor to mission accomplishment. The Department of Defense has issued standards without checking with the Congress, without having any hearings and I think without fully assessing what the cost and operational impact will be.

These building security standards preclude the Department of Defense from leasing any office space in a metropolitan area because they require a setback of anywhere from 82 feet to 148 feet from the street. Under these newly issued requirements, buildings cannot have underground or rooftop parking. They cannot have retail activity on the ground floor. They basically cannot be accessible to the public or have reasonable traffic and parking plans in operation.

We have been working in Northern Virginia in concert with the Pentagon for years to get the Department of Defense employees to their work in a

cost-efficient manner and to be able to meet the Pentagon's needs.

□ 1230

Now they say none of your buildings qualify. Well, I am not going to go into this just for my own self-serving purposes, but I do think that when DOD issues a mandatory requirement affecting tens of thousands of people that its consequences ought to be fully considered. In this case, it is a mandate that has been imposed unilaterally, resulting in the displacement of over 23,000 Defense Department personnel in Northern Virginia. It is going to affect additional thousands of people around the country.

But beyond that, it is going to require hundreds of millions of dollars to build new buildings with this enormous setback from the street, and no one else is going to want to use these buildings. The cost premium of building these buildings that meet the prescriptive DOD standards is so excessive that no other activity is going to be able to afford the cost of these buildings. So we are talking about hundreds of millions of dollars spent excessively to build buildings that will soon become outmoded by technology and common sense.

The General Services Administration has come up with an alternative, what is called a performance-based standard, as opposed to DOD's prescriptive-based standard, that provides just as much security, but they use traffic management, they harden the building, make the windows shatterproof, and move the most sensitive activities to the interior space. They use technology, they use a lot of common sense and judgment, and they accomplish the same purpose and still they can locate buildings in metropolitan areas at much less expense. They just built a building in New York that meets all of the building security standards, much less expensive than DOD wants but just as secure from terrorist attack.

So what I am suggesting is that this subcommittee look at this matter, look at the cost implications, consider whether there may be better ways of accomplishing the same security objectives. This DOD requirement is based upon protecting ourselves from a truck bomb carrying an arbitrary figure of 200 pounds of TNT, whereas a truck can carry 1,000 pounds of TNT. Furthermore, there are so many other ways a building could be attacked that these security standards don't address.

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I would be happy yield to my friend, to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for bringing this to us. This certainly would have an impact on all metropolitan areas where land values are high. So I would be happy to work with the gentleman as we go forward with this bill.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, would the

gentleman consider some report language, requiring some feedback from the Defense Department on cost implications and alternative ways of accomplishing the same security objectives?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I certainly cannot commit to language I haven't seen, but as I said, I would be happy to continue to work with the gentleman as we go towards conference.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend very much and look forward to fixing this situation in a fiscally efficient and operationally effective manner.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues Chairman WALSH and Ranking Member EDWARDS for including two provisions very important to me and so many Americans in this legislation.

This bill preserves the organization of our Defense Cancer Research Programs, which have served our Nation so well and have helped drive breakthroughs in breast, prostate and ovarian cancer research. Consolidation of these programs would have disrupted and delayed the granting of research awards, siphoned scarce resources away from research endeavors to support administrative functions. And I am pleased my colleagues, with the help of Mr. Murtha, were able to maintain the distinct nature of these cancer research programs.

I am especially pleased by the funding level for ovarian cancer research. Ovarian cancer is the fourth deadliest cancer for women. This year, approximately 22,220 women will be diagnosed and an estimated 16,210 will lose their lives to the disease. One in 57 women will get ovarian cancer, a disease with a 5-year survival rate of only 24 percent when caught in advanced stages. As an ovarian cancer survivor, I can tell you first-hand how important early detection is critical.

Despite progress made, we still do not fully understand the risks factors, symptoms and causes of ovarian cancer. Unlike other diseases and conditions, there is no screening test for ovarian cancer—there is no equivalent to the mammogram. And as such, more than 80 percent of women are diagnosed late stages when prognosis is the worst, and the overall rates of ovarian cancer mortality remain unchanged year after year.

Appropriately, the DOD Ovarian Cancer Research Program is focusing its efforts on developing science and scientists to help us achieve the breakthroughs desperately needed in the field of ovarian cancer. Sustaining the current structure of the program and providing sufficient resources will help speed the day that we have a valid and reliable early detection tool for ovarian cancer reducing and preventing suffering from ovarian cancer for our nation's wives, mothers, aunts, nieces, daughters, and friends.

Mr. Chairman, this bill also includes \$2.2 billion in funding for veterans' mental health needs—and I want to thank my colleague, Mr. EDWARDS, for ensuring that it did. Many of us have long been concerned with the growing mental health needs of our returning soldiers, marines, sailors and airmen. That is why I offered an amendment to add additional funding to the Supplemental for veterans mental health needs.

Today, more than one-quarter of Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom veterans who seek care at the VA do so for mental health reasons. And according to the *New England Journal of Medicine*, 16 percent of surveyed Marines and 17 percent of Army soldiers meet screening criteria for major depression, generalized anxiety, or PTSD. These rates are similar to those of service men and women in the Vietnam and Gulf Wars. And I understand from some in the veterans community that these numbers may even understate the severity of the problem.

While this bill will help provide the VA with some of the tools to meet the needs of our brave servicemembers, I do believe we have a moral obligation to do more. In particular, I am concerned that the overall VA budget is not sufficient to meet the needs of troops returning from Iraq and Afghanistan. The American Legion and other veterans groups have said that this bill falls short by as much as \$2.5 billion in veterans health care funding. Indeed, in my own district, veterans tell me that they are waiting up to 9 months for some surgical procedures. And our veterans deserve better than that.

Mr. Chairman, ensuring that we are funding cancer research and providing services to our veterans are two of the most important responsibilities we have with this bill. And I am pleased the House was able to come together in a bipartisan way to see that we did. That is why I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of this appropriations bill, although with some reservations. I am pleased that the reorganization of the appropriations bills has brought about a more logical and supportable Veterans Affairs appropriations product.

I do retain strong concerns over some of the funds appropriated under the Military Construction and North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program sections of this bill.

Although I recognize the need for legitimate funds for military construction, I do remain concerned that the funds appropriated herein will be used to fund the construction of U.S. military installations overseas. At a time when we are closing dozens of military installations in the United States—installations that actually contribute to the defense of the United States—under the auspices of saving money, it is unconscionable to be spending money for the defense of foreign countries.

I also strongly object to the appropriation of U.S. taxpayer funds for, as the bill states, "the acquisition and construction of military facilities and installations (including international military headquarters) and for related expenses for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area." NATO is a relic of the Cold War and most certainly has no purpose some fifteen years after the fall of the Soviet Union. As we saw in the NATO invasion of Yugoslavia, having outlived its usefulness as a defensive alliance, the Organization has become an arm of aggressive militarism and interventionism. NATO deserves not a dime of American taxpayer's money, nor should the United States remain a member.

In conclusion, though I support this appropriations bill, I remain concerned about the construction of military bases overseas and the dangerous interventionist foreign policy that drives this construction.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak on H.R. 2528 the

Military Quality of Life—Veterans Affairs Appropriations. Unfortunately, in rising to speak on this spending legislation, I have to tell our Nation's veterans that they can not expect the level of medical care that they deserve from this appropriation's measure. The sad truth is that our veteran's have been getting the short end of the stick, and unfortunately they will receive no relief from H.R. 2528.

Being from the City of Houston, which is the home to the Michael E. DeBakey Veterans Affairs Medical Center where more than 137,000 veterans are provided their primary healthcare, I know how vitally important it is to provide our veterans with the care they were promised. Now is the time for the U.S. government to again fulfill our moral obligation to those who have fought for freedom and democracy. However, as outrageous as it may seem, this body will not be considering the Obey Amendment that would have increased this bill's appropriation for veterans' medical care by a total of \$2.6 billion. The Obey Amendment would have paid for this vitally important medical care by simply reducing the size of the tax cut for those making over one million dollars, those millionaires would have received a tax cut of \$129,000 this year, instead of \$140,000. Is this what our Nation has come to? Where we chose to give millionaires a few thousand dollars more in tax cuts instead of funding proper medical care for our veterans, who left their families and risked their lives abroad to keep our Nation free, does this seem just in any way? Its truly a shame that the Appropriations Committee in a completely partisan vote decided to reject the Obey Amendment and its truly disgraceful that the Rules Committee did not allow this pertinent Amendment to come before this body for full consideration.

The sad secret of Veterans Affairs and medical care for our veterans is that with the rising cost of health care these days, the modest increases in funding for veterans' medical care in this legislation are not even enough to maintain the current level of care, which in itself is insufficient. Our veterans need and deserve proper VA benefits because they depend so heavily upon them. According to the Veteran's Administration, 28 million veterans are currently using VA benefits. Another 70 million Americans are potential candidates for such programs. This amounts to a quarter of the country's population. Veterans and their families will sadly begin finding that they have no place to turn for their medical treatment as V.A. hospitals across the country face closing their doors. With the budget shrinking, staff will be let go. This could mean the loss of over 19,000 nurses. Without these nurses, this leads to the loss of over 6.6 million outpatient visits. Approximately one out of every two veterans could lose their only source of medical care. This is a shameful situation and one that again is not properly addressed in this appropriation bill.

While I am greatly disappointed that this legislation does not fully address the crisis in veterans medical care, I am pleased to find that the Appropriations Committee rejected the administration's proposal to restrict payments to State veterans' homes for long-term care, and provides sufficient funding within this account to continue the current policy. I am also pleased the Appropriations Committee directed the VA to work with the National Association of State Veterans Homes and other stakeholders to develop and implement solu-

tions that will give veterans the best options for quality long-term care at the most reasonable cost to the taxpayer. I can only hope that this legislation offers our veterans more options in getting quality long-term care instead of less.

We must protect the rights of our veterans because they went abroad and protected our Nation when they were called to duty. I find it unfortunate that this legislation only goes half-way towards solving the veterans medical care crisis that exists, the sad fact is that it could do so much more. I can only pray that all members of Congress will give the same effort in fighting for our veterans that they did fighting for us.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, as a Senior Member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I oppose this appropriations bill because the amount included for veterans' healthcare is woefully inadequate. An additional \$2.6 billion, the amount called for in the Obey amendment which was not accepted, is desperately needed for the coming fiscal year because the number of veterans is growing and the quantity of health care per veteran is growing.

As many of our servicemembers return from Iraq and Afghanistan without legs and arms and with many and varied physical and mental health care needs, as many of our veterans live longer and need long-term care, a grateful nation should be prepared to provide for them. Shamefully, this appropriations bill does not keep that promise, and I cannot support it.

Finally, the new appropriations structure irresponsibly pits active military needs against veterans needs. Our great Nation can support both!

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Obey Amendment. This amendment provides badly needed funding for veterans health care, and represents the minimum necessary to maintain the current level of services.

While the increase in veterans health care funding in the underlying Military Quality of Life and Veterans Appropriations bill is welcome, it is also inadequate. The underlying bill fails to maintain the level of health care provided to our veterans at time when demand for those services is on the rise. The Obey Amendment corrects this by providing an additional \$2.6 billion to ensure that all our veterans receive the health care they have earned and that they deserve.

I am disappointed that the President has failed to provide leadership on this issue. His request for less than a 1 percent increase for VA health care services was completely inadequate to meet the needs of our veterans. Furthermore, for the third straight year, the President proposed doubling prescription drug co-pays to \$15 and charging a \$250 enrollment fee to many of our veterans. Fortunately, the Appropriations Committee has rejected placing this unfair burden on our Nation's veterans and did not impose these new fees.

I urge the Majority to allow a vote on the Obey Amendment and let the House complete the work of writing a bill that honors our veterans by providing the necessary health care resources. This is the very least we can do for the men and women who have given so much in the service of our country.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs Appropriations bill and

would like to commend the gentleman from New York—Mr. WALSH—and the gentleman from Texas Mr. EDWARDS—(and their very able staff) for their good work on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, many of us will spend this weekend doing exactly what we should be doing—returning home to our communities to pay solemn tribute to those brave men and women who have paid the ultimate price in service of our Nation.

We are painfully mindful that we are a Nation at war. Our young fighting men and women are in action around the world, serving with distinction and dedication. To honor them, we should pass this legislation which provides important assistance to our American heroes—past and present—our veterans and our current warfighters.

This legislation: Significantly increases funding devoted to military housing and health care. Increases total funding for the VA by 3.5 percent; Boosts Veterans Medical Services \$1 billion above the budget request and \$1.64 billion over last year's levels: (Over the last 2 years, funding for Veterans medical care has increased by 18 percent.)

Appropriates \$20 billion for the Defense Health Program—a 9.9 percent increase over fiscal 2005. Proposes a 10-percent increase in the basic allowance for military housing; Hikes total military construction 4.2 increase above last year's levels.

Mr. Chairman, our troops—active, reserve and Guard—are enduring extraordinary mental and physical stress during long tours of duty battling an insurgency engaged in intense guerilla warfare. Clearly, these troops will have special needs, including mental health needs, when they rotate from the combat zone. I am proud that this bill goes to extraordinary lengths to fund treatment of Post Traumatic Stress Syndrome, and doubles funding for mental health research.

We know from experience that the mental health and physical health of our troops are closely linked, and mental health disorders can exacerbate or even induce physical disorders. Returning service men and women need to be treated for both through integrated physical and mental health care and this bill recognizes that fact on many important levels.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to point out what is NOT in this bill, namely higher copays at veterans health care facilities and new annual surcharges for certain categories of veterans.

Mr. Chairman, we are a Nation at war. And our young fighting men and women have real needs. Our veterans have real needs.

I want to thank the Appropriations Committee for providing for those needs and urge support for the bill.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, when the Appropriations Committee realigned its subcommittees earlier this year, one of the larger challenges fell to the measure we are considering today—the Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill. The bill provides benefits, housing, and health care for our military troops and their families; and ensures that our veterans—who have given so much for our Nation—continue to receive pensions, readjustment benefits, loans, and medical care. I am pleased to rise in full support of the bill the appropriators have crafted.

MILITARY QUALITY OF LIFE

In structure, H.R. 2528 adds considerably to the previous Military Construction bill by including the Department of Veterans Affairs; the Defense Health Program; the military personnel base allowance and housing accounts; the military facilities, sustainment, restoration, and modernization accounts; the military environmental restoration accounts; and a number of small related agencies.

The bill is consistent with the levels established in H. Con. Res. 95, the House concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006, which Congress adopted as its fiscal blueprint on April 28th. It stays within the 302(b) allocation to the subcommittee, as provided by the full Appropriations Committee pursuant to the budget resolution. Consequently, it does not violate section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which prohibits consideration of bills in excess of the 302(b)s.

[I should note that the Congressional Budget Office [CBO] has recast the 2005 enacted levels into the new subcommittee structure for this year's appropriations bills, so we can make year-to-year comparisons. Also, please be aware that CBO's figures, which I am using, employ base figures and categories that may differ slightly from those published by the Appropriations Committee.]

H.R. 2528 provides \$53.5 billion to the Department of Defense [DoD]. Of that amount, \$20 billion is for the Defense Health Program, which provides top-notch medical care to our service members and their families at little or no cost to them. This amount represents a slight increase over the President's request and an increase of \$1.8 billion over the 2005 enacted level. This bill also funds the military construction and family housing accounts used by DoD to provide our service members and their families quality housing. The funds made available in this bill for base allowance and housing—\$13.3 billion—also ensure that those serving our country are able to afford to live in quality housing whether on or offbase. This represent an increase of \$1.2 billion over the 2005 enacted level.

H.R. 2528 provides \$31.5 billion in discretionary funds for the Department of Veterans Affairs [VA]. Most of this amount—\$28.8 billion of it—is for the Veterans Health Administration, which provides medical care to our Nation's veterans, medical research, medical facilities, and medical administration. The largest component is medical care, which is funded at \$21.0 billion, an increase of \$745 million over the President's request and an increase of \$1.1 billion, or 6 percent, over the 2005 enacted level. The bill does not include a medical care enrollment fee or an increase in prescription drug copayments. H.R. 2528 provides total discretionary funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs of \$33.7 billion, an increase of \$637 million above the President's request and an increase of \$2.9 billion, or 9.5 percent, above the 2005 enacted level.

H.R. 2528 does not contain any emergency-designated BA, which is exempt from budget limits. The bill contains no rescission of previously enacted discretionary BA.

IOWA

I would also like to acknowledge a specific provision that benefits the National Guard in my State. The measure includes \$431,000 for planning and design of a field maintenance shop at Readiness Center in Iowa City.

THE BUDGET RESOLUTION/CONCLUSION

As I have noted before, the budget resolution provides a total allocation for discretionary appropriations of \$843 billion in fiscal year 2006. This relatively tight spending level requires significant effort by the Appropriations Committee to set priorities and make choices. As we continue the appropriations season, I commend Chairman Lewis and our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for meeting the needs of the American public within the framework established by the budget resolution.

In conclusion, I express my support for H.R. 2528.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I have no other speakers on this side, so I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2528

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for military quality of life functions of the Department of Defense, military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Army as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Army Corps of Engineers and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, and for construction and operation of facilities in support of the functions of the Commander in Chief, \$1,602,552,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$168,804,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, and host nation support, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MELANCON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MELANCON:

Page 2, line 15, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$1) (increased by \$1)".

Page 10, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$169,000,000)".

Page 31, line 1, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$23,000,000)".

Page 34, line 21, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$8,000,000)".

Page 36, line 9, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$6,000,000)".

Page 37, line 8, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$9,000,000)".

Page 37, line 20, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$7,000,000)".

Mr. MELANCON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MELANCON. Mr. Chairman, as I begin my remarks, let me say that in my first 2 days as a newly sworn-in Congressman, I had the unfortunate experience of attending seven funerals for young men within a 20-mile radius of my home.

I bring this war-related veterans service amendment to you today. This amendment provides an additional \$53 million in urgently needed funding for items critical for veterans returning from the war. The increased money for vets is paid for by cutting back this year's funding for the next round of the BRAC by 9 percent.

The amendment will provide \$8 million for combat-related trauma care. The VA is currently operating four polytrauma centers for research, education and clinical activities on complex multitrauma associated with combat injuries. The important work of these centers needs to be expanded and demands dedicated funding.

Six million dollars is provided for hardware and software to support telemedicine initiatives to allow the polytrauma centers to support wounded troops once they return to their homes. Long-term follow-up is particularly problematic for Reservists and National Guardsmen who return to their communities without the support of nearby military bases.

Nine million dollars is added for medical and prosthetic research, which is needed to support current spending levels for VA research. Last year, this was funded at \$402, but the bill only includes \$393, a \$9 million cut. Unlike NIH, VA research is uniquely focused on veterans' health issues. It investigates new prosthetic devices, infectious disease, the effects of various environmental hazards, postdeployment mental health and war-related illnesses. Veterans returning from the global war on terrorism will all benefit from this research. It should not be cut.

Provide retroactively \$23 million for war orphans: Surviving spouses with minor children are eligible for Dependency and Indemnity Compensation to assist the families with immediate and transitional needs after the death of a spouse. Right now, only servicemember families whose spouses die after November 30, 2004, receive this \$250 per

month benefit for 2 years. This amendment will help approximately 4,100 spouses with children whose service-member spouse died during the war on terrorism between September 11, 2001, and November 30, 2004.

This will also provide \$7 million for 100 additional staff who process claims for compensation and pension benefits. Veterans coming home from the war deserve quick response to their claims, but as of May 21, 2005, over half a million claims for compensation and pension benefits were pending at VA regional offices. This includes 342,811 claims by veterans who are seeking a disability rating.

I propose a BRAC offset. The administration requested \$1.88 billion for fiscal year 2006 for the new round of BRAC. While the administration was formulating this request, the DOD consistently was stating that there was about a 20 to 24 percent excess capacity in military installations. Then, on May 12, just 2 weeks ago, Secretary Rumsfeld reported at a press conference that the new BRAC list would only cut between 5 and 11 percent of excess capacity.

The 2005 BRAC round will actually require less than half of the closure and realignment activities originally projected. The administration's budget request reflects much more money than will be needed to be spent for BRAC activities in fiscal year 2006.

The bill already cuts \$310 million from the BRAC request, and the program would not suffer with an additional \$169 million cut. This is well under the \$180 million in additional cuts that was approved by the Committee on Armed Services.

While it is important to begin funding the implementation of the new BRAC round, this money is the first installment in a process that will take several years. By contrast, money for veterans' health is urgently needed, especially in the critical areas funded in this amendment. We need to take care of our servicemen and -women returning from the war as they come home.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to welcome the gentleman to the Congress. We are very proud and happy that he is here, and I hate to oppose the very first amendment that he is offering, but I think it is the responsible thing to do.

We believe this bill is a balanced bill that addresses all of the needs of the Nation in a fair manner. This amendment would cut \$169 million from the funding required to carry out the BRAC recommendation. This cut would slow down the cleanup and disposal of closed bases for this round, and also the realignment of bases, and will therefore negatively impact the economies of those communities by stalling

the reuse and development of that land.

Now, the gentleman is from Louisiana. As we are all aware, there were a number of closures and realignments in the State of Louisiana, particularly around Baton Rouge and New Orleans, if this amendment were to pass, the redevelopment of those bases and properties, and I am sure land values are quite high in New Orleans and people would like to redevelop those properties, that would stall. It would be delayed. It would cause confusion. And I suspect that others Members of the Louisiana delegation may not want to support this because it will definitely affect their communities.

I would also offer that at this point we are talking about a list of proposed closures. We do not know exactly which bases will be closed or realigned until the process is over.

We do know one thing, though, that this \$169 million that the gentleman would like to take out of BRAC will not get you, dollar for dollar, the money that you would like to see spent in veterans' health care.

Because of our budget rules, this money that is in the BRAC fund, the \$169 million that the gentleman would like to cut from BRAC, will only get \$30 million. It would only free up \$30 million in 2006 for the purposes that the gentleman has described.

The reason is because, again, under our budget rules, this money in BRAC spends out or outlays at a rate of only 15 percent. So, in effect, this is penny wise and pound foolish, because you lose almost \$170 million in the BRAC funding to get \$30 million in veterans' health. That money would be much better spent in BRAC, because you will get the full benefit of \$170 million.

The bill that we presented does much to improve VA health care by adding \$1 billion to the budget request. This results in an 8.5 percent increase over last year and over a 40 percent increase since the year 2001. So as I have said before to Members who appeared before the hearing, members of the veterans community, the House has the power of the purse. We establish our priorities by how we allocate funds, how we appropriate funds. And other than Defense health, no area, no budget within the Federal budget, has increased the way veterans' health care has. This would be an 18.2 percent increase in 2 years in veterans' health care.

So this would do great harm to the BRAC and it would do little to impact on veterans' health care. This comes at a high cost to BRAC, especially when one considers the large increases that we have already provided in veterans' health care programs.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge that the Members oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MELANCON).

Mr. MELANCON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York

(Chairman WALSH) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), and I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) for the welcome to the floor of the House, to the Chamber. It is an honor to be here.

I, too, regret that the gentleman has to oppose my amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I simply want to say that I congratulate the gentleman for offering this amendment. I would say that I greatly respect the chairman of the subcommittee, but I disagree with the implication of one thing that he said. He is evidently suggesting that because of a difference in outlay rates between these two accounts, that we would not get the full amount in the amendment, or that the full amount in the amendment would not be immediately made available for the purposes of the amendment.

I would simply point out that whether it is \$79 million being redirected or \$53 million being redirected, it is still better than nothing.

□ 1245

I would also say that BRAC is going to go on for a long, long time. We have no idea how much money we are going to need for BRAC, and this Congress will be adjusting what it provides for BRAC many times over, the next 7 or 8 or 9 years. But the fact is that the troops coming home now need these services now. I do not think that anyone believes that either the budget amount or the amount in the committee is fully sufficient, given the needs of the troops.

So I would urge a "yes" vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MELANCON).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MELANCON) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

In addition, \$50,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007, for overhead cover systems to support force protection activities in Iraq: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, such funds may be obligated or expended to carry out planning and design and military construction projects not otherwise authorized by law.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, facilities, and real property for the Navy and Marine Corps as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$1,109,177,000, to remain available

until September 30, 2010: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$36,029,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Air Force as currently authorized by law, \$1,171,338,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$91,733,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, installations, facilities, and real property for activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as currently authorized by law, \$976,664,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010: *Provided*, That such amounts of this appropriation as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to such appropriations of the Department of Defense available for military construction or family housing as the Secretary may designate, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$107,285,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$410,624,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$225,727,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army Reserve as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$138,425,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVAL RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the reserve components of the Navy and Marine Corps as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$45,226,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air Force Reserve as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$110,847,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

For the United States share of the cost of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program for the acquisition and construction of military facilities and installations (including international military headquarters) and for related expenses for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area as authorized by section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$206,858,000, to remain available until expended.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For expenses of family housing for the Army for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension, and alteration, as authorized by law, \$549,636,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For expenses of family housing for the Army for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, \$803,993,000.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For expenses of family housing for the Navy and Marine Corps for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension, and alteration, as authorized by law, \$218,942,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For expenses of family housing for the Navy and Marine Corps for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, \$588,660,000.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension, and alteration, as authorized by law, \$1,236,220,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, \$755,319,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the chairman of

the Subcommittee on Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs of the Committee on Appropriations.

First of all, I want to take a moment to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the committee for bringing this important pending bill to the floor and providing resources to our military and those who serve in our military. I thank him for his leadership in the United States House of Representatives and for his service to our Nation.

I had intended to offer an amendment to add \$1.3 million to the Army National Guard construction account in order to complete the design of a joint National Guard Reserve Center in Daytona Beach, Florida. Last year, through the good work of this appropriations subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Military Construction appropriated \$789,000 in fiscal year 2005 funding to begin the design, and that funding is now being depleted.

Mr. Chairman, this project is the Florida National Guard's number one priority in the 2012 to 2013, 5-year plan and will be included in the President's budget for the 2007 budget.

I am concerned that possibly cutting the funding or not providing the funding for this project now may negatively impact on the Florida National Guard's ability to move forward with this important project that is now some nearly 8 years behind schedule.

I would ask the gentleman from New York whether he can commit to working with me during the conference on this bill to ensure that funding or adequate attention and language is in the final bill.

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

Mr. MICA. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Florida for his hard work and his dedication to getting this base back on track, and I will be happy to work with the gentleman from Florida as we go forward.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of entering into a colloquy with the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH).

Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy to discuss a funding matter concerning the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives program.

I rise today, Mr. Chairman, to bring attention to a significant funding problem that, if it is not solved, could halt the destruction of dangerous chemical weapons stockpiles in Richmond, Kentucky and Pueblo, Colorado.

Within the last 2 months, there have been significant changes in the status of what is known as the ACWA program which manages the Blue Grass Ammunition Demilitarization Facility at the Blue Grass Army Depot in Kentucky and at the Pueblo Chemical Depot in Pueblo, Colorado.

Due to recent Department of Defense decisions, the President's fiscal year 2006 budget no longer reflects the funding requirements needed for the Blue Grass site.

If the United States is to meet the 100 percent extended destruction deadline of April 2012 set by the Chemical Weapons Convention, a total of \$31 million in funding needs to be allocated to the Military Quality of Life Chemical Demilitarization Construction account.

This \$31 million would come in the form of a zero-sum adjustment to the President's budget, as he had included a \$33 million request for ACWA under the RDT&E account.

I recognize that this bill does not have jurisdiction over the RDT&E account, which complicates the transfer of these funds. However, I request that when the House and Senate conferees meet to reconcile the two versions of this bill, that they consider adding these vital military construction funds to the ACWA program.

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

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I am aware that the Department of Defense wants to revise the budget request for this program. I am also aware that the Department does not want to submit a budget amendment. The gentleman from Kentucky is correct, the jurisdiction complicates the transfer of funds from RDT&E to the Chemical Demilitarization Construction account, and the timing of this request is also a complicating factor. However, I assure the gentleman from Kentucky that this issue will be kept in mind during the conference consideration of this bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from New York for his recognition of both the funding needs of the ACWA program and the need to dispose of these dangerous weapons that threaten the safety of communities in Richmond, Kentucky and Pueblo, Colorado.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND
MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of family housing for the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) for operation and maintenance, leasing, and minor construction, as authorized by law, \$46,391,000.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH).

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would be pleased to engage in a colloquy with my friend, from the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from New York is aware, over 75 million Americans suffer seri-

ous pain, and over 50 million of these endure serious pain with a duration of 6 months or more. Many of these Americans are being treated in facilities within the Department of Veterans Affairs. Currently, available treatment mechanisms do not cure the pain and usually involve medications that are hardly more effective than a placebo, while introducing the risk of serious side effects. Recent clinical findings are causing widespread concern that pain killers available through prescription and over the counter are placing users at additional risk.

As the chairman of the appropriations subcommittee that must find funding to pay for these medications, the gentleman from New York has an important role in directing the Department of Veterans Affairs to use their medical dollars wisely.

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

Mr. MEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I am aware of those facts and of the significant cost to society in the form of dollars and the quality of life.

I am also recently aware that research being done in the gentleman's district may lead to significant changes in how we treat pain and offers the promise of reducing the side effects. This research in the area of photon mediated treatment for pain, in effect using light and its associated heat, offers enough hope that I would suggest it as an area of further research within the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his remarks and look forward to working with him as he moves this bill forward and into conference. I would hope that the conference statement of managers would include a suggestion to the Department of Veterans Affairs that they consider doing research in this area.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I thank the gentleman and pledge to do all I can to work with the other body to put some language on this subject in the statement of managers when we get to conference.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage with the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) in a brief colloquy, if he would be so kind, on the subject of cleanup at closed bases.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I am happy to enter into a colloquy with my friend, the gentleman from California.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to bring to the attention of the House a problem that desperately needs attention, which is cleanup at our closed military bases. I realize that in today's tight budget situation, we have dif-

ficult choices to make, but I think it is critical that the Members of this body realize that the issue of cleanup at military bases, both the active bases and the closed bases, but especially at those that are closed, is literally a time bomb.

Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) has tried to accommodate the cleanup needs of closed bases. Through the gentleman's efforts, this bill provides \$377 million in BRAC money for previous rounds of closed bases. Most of this will go to cleanup, but that is far from enough to complete the cleanup and transfer this land to others so that economic growth can occur.

To my colleagues I say, if we are serious about BRAC, we have to get serious about cleanup. DOD officials claim that earlier rounds of BRAC have saved about \$7 billion a year, but that is false savings when the Defense Science Board Task Force on UXO, unexploded ordnances, in February of 2004, put the cost of unexploded ordnance cleanup between \$26 billion and \$52 billion.

Just this past January, the GAO reported that \$3.6 billion remains to be cleaned up at closed bases, and identified the base in my district, closed base Fort Ord, as having yet another \$322 million in cleanup costs before the land can be transferred. This is on top of the \$327 million that has already been spent on the cleanup at Fort Ord.

□ 1300

The scope of this problem is large, and Fort Ord is not the only problem. The same GAO report shows that Kelly Air Force Base in Texas still has about \$209 million in cleanup costs outstanding. Seneca Army Depot in New York has \$72 million in cleanup costs remaining. Savanna Depot in Illinois has \$55 million, and the naval air station in South Weymouth, Massachusetts, has \$39 million. The five bases cited carry a \$697 million cleanup price tag, yet the bill is only able to provide \$377 million for that purpose, less than half.

If, 10 years after the last BRAC round, we are still struggling to remove these bases from the Pentagon's inventory, but cannot because of cleanup problems, how are we going to cope with a round that was just announced a week ago?

BRAC has become all about disposal of military property. We have forgotten about the part of BRAC that is supposed to be about conversion of military property.

Disposal must contain a more aggressive component of cleanup so that conversion and, therefore, economic recovery can take place more quickly and more effectively.

I would suggest one option for us to consider is to rescind the MILCON money in this bill currently slated for bases that are on the closure list, and reallocate it to the BRAC cleanup. Closing bases do not need new construction, but they will need cleanup.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), who is a respected and active member of the subcommittee and knows these issues very well. Certainly, the gentleman has made us all more sensitive to the problems of unexploded ordnance and hazardous wastes at closed bases, and I commend the gentleman for that.

While I do not dispute the gentleman's logic, I cannot endorse his suggestion at this time.

As we all know, the Secretary of Defense released his BRAC recommendations to the BRAC Commission on May 13. At this time, they are just that, recommendations to the Commission. It is the Commission who will present the final report to the President later this year.

However, I will commit to my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), that we will be following this process closely, and as we move to conference on this bill, I will work with him to adjust the funding available for cleanup of bases closed in previous BRAC rounds.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I appreciate his commitment to address this matter in conference and eagerly look forward to working with the gentleman on it.

I thank the chairman for engaging in this colloquy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING
IMPROVEMENT FUND

For the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund, \$2,500,000, to remain available until expended, for family housing initiatives undertaken pursuant to section 2883 of title 10, United States Code, providing alternative means of acquiring and improving military family housing and supporting facilities.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT
1990

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990, established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), \$377,827,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR.
BLUMENAUER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. BLUMENAUER:

Page 9, line 22, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$351,000,000)".

Page 10, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$351,000,000)".

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciated what we just heard a moment ago from the chairman and my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR). And I appreciate the gentleman's long involvement with this issue and sensitizing us to it.

I am deeply concerned that the parameters that the gentleman from California outlined are such that we are going to have to take a serious step back and do something this Congress. I mentioned earlier, I know that the new subcommittee's configuration gave it broad scope with lots to do. But it is time for us to take a step back and give proper focus to the problem of military cleanup on bases that have been realigned and closed.

My amendment would simply say, before we start the fifth round of base closure, the fifth round, that we ought to take some of that money that has been designated for the fifth round and instead keep faith with the 17 communities that are waiting, now since 1988, to have their problems solved.

We are all aware of the trauma that can take place in communities when bases close, how they lose jobs. They are upset. But to compound it by leaving people with a toxic white elephant is absolutely unacceptable.

I have before me here a list of the 1988 BRAC installations and the estimated date of the cleanup. At the top of the list, in no particular order, in Sacramento, California. They are going to have to wait till the year 2072 to be able to fully clean this up.

As we go down the list, it is absolutely unacceptable. It is one of the reasons that we find such apprehension regarding the BRAC process, although there is the promise of redevelopment. There are opportunities that we have seen, for example, in Lowry Air Force Base in Denver. Where it is done right, bases can be cleaned up, it can add economic vitality to communities. The sorry fact is that we have not kept faith with the communities that have suffered base closure.

I strongly urge that each and every Member of Congress take a step back. To the best of my knowledge, we have not voted specifically to put money in the cleanup process in at least the 9 years that I have been in Congress, and I have not been able to identify a specific vote before that.

The fact is that Congress is missing in action. There are people in the Department of Defense who are skilled, eager and interested to go. There is a significant private sector range of activities, businesses that are ready to do their job in base cleanup.

What is missing is that Congress has never made it a funding priority. And at the top, at the Pentagon, despite having some great people through the last two administrations who understand this problem, it has never been a top priority of the Pentagon, until we come around again talking about base closures.

I am strongly suggesting that we step forward, that we allocate this \$351 million, put it here, so that we are keeping faith with these people. The fact is that if we were to approve this amendment, it would still be only a third of what is necessary, less than a third of what is necessary to deal with

prior base closures. And frankly, that is just the tip of the iceberg because there are 2,307 formerly used defense sites in every State of the Union that are littered with unexploded ordnance and military toxins.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to bring this amendment forward. I appreciate the opportunity of working with this subcommittee in the future, but I want to make clear that it is time for Congress to no longer be missing in action and to take this small step to keep faith with these people who have been waiting for 17 years for the Pentagon and Congress to do the cleanup job that faces them.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER's) amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me begin by saying that I know the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) brings a tremendous amount of history to this issue and expresses the concerns that all of us feel for communities that have this long-term problem. So I accept his genuineness and his attention to this. And pressure is a good thing.

Let me state that we have just discussed this with my colleague on the subcommittee, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), and we intend to work on this when we get to conference with the Senate.

I would just point out that the Navy recently sold the former Marine Corps Air Station at El Toro in California for \$650 million, which was a much higher price than was anticipated. Since all land sale revenues must come back into the priority BRAC account, there will be some additional funds available in fiscal year 2006 for environmental cleanup.

This amendment is probably not necessary. DOD has indicated that by the year 2008 it will have either completed the cleanup or put into place all the remedial systems it needs for cleanup at all but two installations. Once in place, the cleanup will take time, and more funds will not necessarily speed up the process.

These are areas, for example, where you have a range, firing range, where mortars or small arms or other weaponry was fired and remains unexploded in the ground. It will take time to find that. It is a very dangerous process. I am sure it is a very tedious, stressful process, but it has to be done right, so it does take time.

I would also note that by taking money out of the 2005 BRAC account, the gentleman would actually compound the very problem he is trying to correct for the upcoming BRAC. It will slow down the cleanup and disposal of closed bases for this round and will, therefore, negatively impact the economies of those communities by stalling reuse development.

We do intend to deal with this issue in conference. And we will look at what funds may reasonably be added to the prior BRAC account to accelerate environmental cleanup. We need to make

sure that more funds will actually translate into more effect. Since I do not know, at this time, what that plus-up could be, I am afraid that I must oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise and associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and strongly support his amendment. Let me also add and thank the very thoughtful colloquy that was conducted by the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) and the distinguished chairman from New York (Mr. WALSH). Clearly, his involvement and assistance is much needed and greatly appreciated.

But as a State and, I daresay, for the Northeast as an entire region that has been targeted, when you look at statistically what is going on here in the 17 communities, as the gentleman noted, that are in dire shape, and you look at the length of time as we project out, you now understand why communities have such enormous apprehension about this. Or as Peter Finley Dunne would say, "Trust everyone, but cut the cards." And in the case of the BRAC hearings, we feel that we need a new deal.

I further would just say in listening to the distinguished Chair, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), and again, I applaud him personally for his efforts, while there will be more money available for cleanup from the sale of the El Toro Marine Air Station, the amount needed is over \$3.6 billion. Even with these new funds, we are less than one-third of the way there in terms of the funding. One-third of the way there, and we are adding on all these new communities.

And in looking at what the BRAC findings initially have projected, and especially looking at the State of Connecticut in terms of the cleanup, how drastically underestimated they have been in those areas as well. So these are very disturbing, and that is why I again thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for raising this very important and thoughtful amendment, a common-sense approach, that before we proceed to a fifth round, that we make sure that we address these very important issues that impact all of our communities.

If we are going to have trust in this process, as the gentleman has appropriately pointed out, then Congress cannot abrogate its responsibility. It has to assume that responsibility and assure these communities that are going to be impacted, if we are to proceed in a strategic and very important, common-sense approach to this issue.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to discuss it in a broad sense. I am also very supportive of our chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH). I am on the com-

mittee. But this is an opportunity for us to focus in on the need for base cleanup.

And it is an easy expression to say base "cleanup," the word, but the process is elaborate because there are all kinds of cleanup. Essentially, the cleanup that most people know that would be in any city where you had a motor pool, where you had garages and fuel spent, all bases have that. Those are common kinds of industrial types of cleanup.

You have areas that most communities do not have, which are firing ranges. Most of that is lead cleanup. Those are not necessarily unexploded ordnances because you fire in for targets. You have cleanup because big bases have their own places that they dumped, in many cases, the old days they just dumped the fuel, poured it on the ground, but they also had solid waste sites. And as the rains came the leachates through the solid waste site get into the groundwater. So we have now ground water contamination. That is another cleanup.

And lastly and most elaborately, you have one cleanup that only the Federal Government does and only people that have been trained by the Federal Government, even though they may be in the private sector, are authorized to do. We do all the unexploded ordnance cleanup; nobody else in the world does that. And that cleanup is very specific because, as the chairman said, it is dangerous. It is unexploded ordnances that are in the ground and oftentimes buried. And it is slow.

But the fact of the matter is that if these were private lands, the private sector would have to clean it up. That is the law. And we know about Superfund law and things like that. When it is the government they can take more time and do it at their own pace, and particularly the military, because their mission is to go fight military battles.

□ 1315

The last thing that you want to do is spend a lot of money just trying to clean up the ground which is left behind. And on that ground, are some buildings that, I might add, are old buildings that have lead paint and asbestos in them which have to have certain protocols for getting rid of the lead paint and asbestos.

So unless this attention is given, what people do is they put this stuff on the back burner and say, that is expensive. Let us go at it slowly. We will not have to appropriate enough money to it. You have communities now coming and begging to the military saying, why do you not just give us the money. This is called a buy-out. I am working on this in my own district to see if you can buy a buy-out so that the government can put up the money and the community will accept the responsibility for getting it done. They may be able to get it done faster. They think they can.

So these are the kinds of issues that I think it is important that we focus on. I really applaud the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for not only bringing this amendment to the floor, but he has been doing this for years by trying to tweak the conscience of Congress to say these things are about cleanup. It is a responsibility that the private sector knows they have to do, and we in the public sector ought to be doing the same and particularly the military.

I might add, it is not all criticism of the military. Recently, since the environmental laws have come along, I found that the military has been a very good steward of these laws. In fact, now on all our ranges and all the things that the military does, they have reports of where every shell goes. They keep those reports. They know where the contamination is. They try to do cleanup as they go along, and they try to minimize any kind of adverse impacts on the environment. I applaud the military for that.

We have to be good stewards and good citizens of our communities where our military bases are and take the responsibility for cleaning up these extraordinary amounts of messes, particularly at a time when you want to use that land for economic recovery. And you cannot even get on the land; you cannot walk on it. They put a fence around it. That is the worst thing that can ever happen to a community and to closed bases.

I applaud this effort to bring attention to all of the Members of Congress that we have got a real problem here, and that we have got to focus some attention and figure out the resources that we need to get the job done. I applaud the chairman for his work and conscientiousness in trying to see that we might be able to go some money in conference to address this problem.

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

Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of the Blumenauer amendment that would shift funding for the 2005 BRAC round into accounts that would be used to finish the cleanup of all the installations closed in previous rounds, all of which, by the way, occurred over 10 years ago.

The Department of Defense is currently conducting a review of the military's overseas facility structure as well as the upcoming Quadrennial Defense Review, the QDR. These are important and very telling studies that have not yet been completed that will give us in Congress a much clearer picture of our military's future landscape and needs; and meanwhile, we should take the time to finish the job we started in the late 80s.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday morning I flew home to Marietta, Georgia, in my district, where I had the pleasure of meeting one of the nine BRAC commissioners as he toured Naval Air Station Atlanta in the 11th district. While we

were there, a comment was made that the commander of the facility would like to have rolled the 40-plus planes, Humvees, and Cobra helicopters out on the tarmac for review, but they were all deployed in the war on terror.

Mr. Chairman, the DOD has recommended that these assets be realigned elsewhere; yet I am concerned that proper due diligence has not been paid to consider the overall force structure needs of the military, the very purpose of the QDR that will not be completed for months.

If BRAC is to occur, I believe that it can be carried out in a much more effective manner once we have a better idea about what the future holds. So for that reason, I believe that we should allocate our scarce resources to completing the cleanup necessary for those communities already impacted by BRAC to reclaim the land and put it to good use.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, I fully support the Blumenauer amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, on June 22, 2004, I came to the floor of this house in support of the gentleman from Oregon's (Mr. BLUMENAUER) amendment to the Fiscal Year 2005 Defense Appropriations bill relative to unexploded ordnance (UXO). I rise again today in support of my colleague's UXO amendment.

My home state of Hawaii is the perfect example of how and why funds for the cleanup of UXO are very much needed. Several years ago, the Department of Defense (DOD) identified over fifty DOD-registered locations in my state that have not been cleaned up. These sites continue to present significant and ongoing public safety risks.

One of these locations is the Waikoloa/Waimea Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS) on my Island of Hawaii. The site includes over 137,000 acres and all or parts of the communities of Waikoloa and Waimea (Kamuela). The U.S. Navy acquired the area in 1943 through licensing agreements for use as a military training camp and artillery range. U.S. Marine Corps maneuvers and intensive live-fire training included hand grenades, 4.2-inch mortar, and 37 millimeter (mm), 75mm, 105mm, and 155mm high explosive shells.

The first ordnance cleanup activity occurred in 1946. In 1954, military ordnance disposal units began to identify and dispose of thousands of munitions. The United States Army Corps of Engineers determined the site was eligible for the Defense Environmental Restoration Program Formerly Used Defense Site in 1992.

An engineering evaluation/cost analysis, completed in January 2002, designated the entire property as a potential ordnance health and safety risk. Eleven areas within property (48,000 acres) were determined to have the highest risk, including all of the Waikoloa Village and the developing urban area from Kawaihae to Waimea. In that analysis, the United States Army Corps of Engineers estimated that the cost to complete the cleanup for the entire site is \$653 million.

Mr. Chairman, our military plays a vital role in our society and throughout the world. My state of Hawaii is the location for the regional headquarters of each of the service branches as well as the Pacific Command. Hawaii

proudly continues to play a vital role in America's military, commercial, and diplomatic relations with countries in the Pacific Rim and beyond.

However, I strongly believe that the military must also follow practices espoused by parents, teachers, and camp counselors alike: Leave any place you have visited cleaner than when you arrived. Along these lines, the United States Army Corps of Engineers is ready and willing to be better engaged in the cleanup process. Congress must now take the first step of appropriating sufficient funds for this important action.

I again wish to commend the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for his continued diligent work on this important issue. I look forward to working with him in the future and urge my colleagues to support this important, vital amendment for communities throughout our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. BLUMENAUER:

Page 9, line 22, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$55,000,000)".

Page 10, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$55,000,000)".

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention not to unduly delay this effort. I will withdraw this amendment at the end, but I want to finish the thought because I deeply appreciate what my colleagues have mentioned referencing the unexploded ordnance issue.

I want to agree with what the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) said, the Department of Defense is making tremendous progress dealing with cleanup of unexploded ordnance.

This is a representative sample of the problem. I will tell you that this picture could have been taken at any of dozens of sites around the country. What is most distressing is that we do not know the full extent of all of the unexploded ordnance that is our responsibility.

A couple of years ago, I led a tour with my colleague, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), to the campus of American University where the toxic residue of World War I was still being cleaned up

after three efforts. The child care center was closed down. An athletic field was denied access to athletes, and over the fence, the back yard of the \$10 million little bungalow of the Korean ambassador was all dug up because they were trying to complete what they hoped might be the final cleanup of this site within the boundaries of the District of Columbia. There are 2,307 sites around the country were formally used sites.

It is true that these amendments, as the chairman says, may take a little money away from the fifth round. It may slow it. I would be prepared to argue that in good faith that it is not going to slow it, but frankly, if we cannot keep faith with the people 18 years ago, maybe we should slow it down before we go to the districts in Georgia and Connecticut and elsewhere around the country. But, in fact, I do not think that will be the case.

This program has been plagued by an on-again off-again effort. We have not geared it up. We have not turned loose the expertise in the military and in the private sector, people who could solve these problems if we had a guaranteed stream of funding.

If we did the research, we would find that more people would be in the business, the cost of the bids would go down, we would develop the technology, and not only would we remove unexploded ordnance that is in every State of the Union, but we would develop technology that would make our fighting men and women safer in Iraq and Afghanistan. It would make civilians safer in Southeast Asia and in Africa and the Balkans.

This is our responsibility, and we have been missing in action too long as a Congress.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) talks about the complexity of being able to survey large areas. It takes time. But there is new technology that can speed it up. I have been working with another subcommittee to get funding for what is called Wide Area Assessment. The Defense Science Board says if we would spend a billion dollars over the next 5 years, we could probably identify 8 million acres or more that was not contaminated. We could return it to be wildlife or redeveloped, or it could even be used for other military purposes. It is an example of where, if we do our job, we will save money, we will save lives, we will advance technology, and it will move forward.

I deeply appreciate the time that has been taken this afternoon for this discussion. I appreciate the chairman and ranking member for their engagement in this, for providing feedback to me and my staff and others, for the assurances that in conference we will try to move some of this money around, that the El Toro money that could be used for additional naval cleanup. All this is great, but it is a drop in the bucket of the overall problem. It is less than half of our obligation just for things that we have already closed.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, I am going to withdraw this amendment. I appreciate being able to make the point. I look forward to working with the gentleman, but I would hope that our colleagues will take this seriously because it can have vast implications for military readiness, for the environment, and keeping faith with our communities who expect that we will do our job. Today I hope we will take a step in doing just that.

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

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT
2005

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Realignment and Closure Account 2005, established by section 2906A(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), \$1,570,466,000, to remain available until expended.

BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING, ARMY

For basic allowance for housing, for members of the Army on active duty, \$3,945,392,000.

BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING, NAVY

For basic allowance for housing, for members of the Navy on active duty, \$3,592,905,000.

BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING, MARINE
CORPS

For basic allowance for housing, for members of the Marine Corps on active duty, \$1,179,071,000.

BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING, AIR FORCE

For basic allowance for housing, for members of the Air Force on active duty, \$3,240,113,000.

BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING, ARMY
NATIONAL GUARD

For basic allowance for housing, for members of the Army National Guard on active duty, \$453,690,000.

BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING, AIR
NATIONAL GUARD

For basic allowance for housing, for members of the Air National Guard on active duty, \$248,317,000.

BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING, ARMY
RESERVE

For basic allowance for housing, for members of the Army Reserve on active duty, \$310,566,000.

BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING, NAVAL
RESERVE

For basic allowance for housing, for members of the Naval Reserve on active duty, \$191,338,000.

BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING, MARINE
CORPS RESERVE

For basic allowance for housing, for members of the Marine Corps Reserve on active duty, \$40,609,000.

BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING, AIR FORCE
RESERVE

For basic allowance for housing, for members of the Air Force Reserve on active duty, \$71,286,000.

FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND
MODERNIZATION, ARMY

For expenses for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization of the Army, \$1,850,518,000.

FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND
MODERNIZATION, NAVY

For expenses for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization of the Navy, \$1,344,971,000.

FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND
MODERNIZATION, MARINE CORPS

For expenses for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization of the Marine Corps, \$553,960,000.

FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND
MODERNIZATION, AIR FORCE

For expenses for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization of the Air Force, \$1,845,701,000.

FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND
MODERNIZATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization of the Department of Defense, \$115,400,000.

FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND
MODERNIZATION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For expenses for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization of the Army National Guard, \$391,544,000.

FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND
MODERNIZATION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For expenses for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization of the Air National Guard, \$184,791,000.

FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND
MODERNIZATION, ARMY RESERVE

For expenses for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization of the Army Reserve, \$204,370,000.

FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND
MODERNIZATION, NAVAL RESERVE

For expenses for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization of the Naval Reserve, \$67,788,000.

FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND
MODERNIZATION, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For expenses for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization of the Marine Corps Reserve, \$10,105,000.

FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND
MODERNIZATION, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For expenses for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization of the Air Force Reserve, \$55,764,000.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Army, \$407,865,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Army, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Navy, \$305,275,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings

and debris of the Department of the Navy, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Navy, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Air Force, \$406,461,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Air Force, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Air Force, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of Defense, \$28,167,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of Defense, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of Defense, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY
USED DEFENSE SITES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Army, \$221,921,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris at sites formerly used by the Department of Defense, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation.

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, for medical and health care programs of the Department of Defense, as authorized by law, \$19,983,912,000, of which \$19,184,537,000 shall be

for operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed 2 percent shall remain available until September 30, 2007, and of which up to \$10,212,427,000 may be available for contracts entered into under the TRICARE program; of which \$355,119,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2008, shall be for procurement; and of which \$444,256,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2007, shall be for research, development, test and evaluation: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the amount made available under this heading for research, development, test and evaluation, not less than \$7,500,000 shall be available for HIV prevention educational activities undertaken in connection with U.S. military training, exercises, and humanitarian assistance activities conducted primarily in African nations.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. None of the funds made available in this title shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for construction, where cost estimates exceed \$25,000, to be performed within the United States, except Alaska, without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the reasons therefor.

SEC. 102. Funds appropriated in this title for construction shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles.

SEC. 103. Funds appropriated in this title for construction may be used for advances to the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, for the construction of access roads as authorized by section 210 of title 23, United States Code, when projects authorized therein are certified as important to the national defense by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 104. None of the funds made available in this title may be used to begin construction of new bases in the United States for which specific appropriations have not been made.

SEC. 105. None of the funds made available in this title shall be used for purchase of land or land easements in excess of 100 percent of the value as determined by the Army Corps of Engineers or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, except: (1) where there is a determination of value by a Federal court; (2) purchases negotiated by the Attorney General or the designee of the Attorney General; (3) where the estimated value is less than \$25,000; or (4) as otherwise determined by the Secretary of Defense to be in the public interest.

SEC. 106. None of the funds made available in this title shall be used to: (1) acquire land; (2) provide for site preparation; or (3) install utilities for any family housing, except housing for which funds have been made available in annual Acts making appropriations for military construction.

SEC. 107. None of the funds made available in this title for minor construction may be used to transfer or relocate any activity from one base or installation to another, without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

SEC. 108. None of the funds made available in this title may be used for the procurement of steel for any construction project or activity for which American steel producers, fabricators, and manufacturers have been denied the opportunity to compete for such steel procurement.

SEC. 109. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for military construction or family housing during the current fiscal year may be used to pay real property taxes in any foreign nation.

SEC. 110. None of the funds made available in this title may be used to initiate a new in-

stallation overseas without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

SEC. 111. None of the funds made available in this title may be obligated for architect and engineer contracts estimated by the Government to exceed \$500,000 for projects to be accomplished in Japan, in any NATO member country, or in countries bordering the Arabian Sea, unless such contracts are awarded to United States firms or United States firms in joint venture with host nation firms.

SEC. 112. None of the funds made available in this title for military construction in the United States territories and possessions in the Pacific and on Kwajalein Atoll, or in countries bordering the Arabian Sea, may be used to award any contract estimated by the Government to exceed \$1,000,000 to a foreign contractor: *Provided*, That this section shall not be applicable to contract awards for which the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a United States contractor exceeds the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a foreign contractor by greater than 20 percent: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to contract awards for military construction on Kwajalein Atoll for which the lowest responsive and responsible bid is submitted by a Marshallese contractor.

SEC. 113. The Secretary of Defense is to inform the appropriate committees of both Houses of Congress, including the Committees on Appropriations, of the plans and scope of any proposed military exercise involving United States personnel 30 days prior to its occurring, if amounts expended for construction, either temporary or permanent, are anticipated to exceed \$100,000.

SEC. 114. Not more than 20 percent of the funds made available in this title which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last 2 months of the fiscal year.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 115. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction in prior years shall be available for construction authorized for each such military department by the authorizations enacted into law during the current session of Congress.

SEC. 116. For military construction or family housing projects that are being completed with funds otherwise expired or lapsed for obligation, expired or lapsed funds may be used to pay the cost of associated supervision, inspection, overhead, engineering and design on those projects and on subsequent claims, if any.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds appropriated to a military department or defense agency for the construction of military projects may be obligated for a military construction project or contract, or for any portion of such a project or contract, at any time before the end of the fourth fiscal year after the fiscal year for which funds for such project were appropriated if the funds obligated for such project: (1) are obligated from funds available for military construction projects; and (2) do not exceed the amount appropriated for such project, plus any amount by which the cost of such project is increased pursuant to law.

SEC. 118. The Secretary of Defense is to provide the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress with an annual report by February 15, containing details of the specific actions proposed to be taken by the Department of Defense during the current fiscal year to encourage other member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Japan, Korea, and United States allies bordering the Arabian Sea to assume a greater share of the common defense burden of such nations and the United States.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 119. In addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, proceeds deposited to the Department of Defense Base Closure Account established by section 207(a)(1) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (10 U.S.C. 2687 note) pursuant to section 207(a)(2)(C) of such Act, may be transferred to the account established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), to be merged with, and to be available for the same purposes and the same time period as that account.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 120. Subject to 30 days prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress, such additional amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to: (1) the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund from amounts appropriated for construction in "Family Housing" accounts, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same period of time as amounts appropriated directly to the Fund; or (2) the Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund from amounts appropriated for construction of military unaccompanied housing in "Military Construction" accounts, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same period of time as amounts appropriated directly to the Fund: *Provided*, That appropriations made available to the Funds shall be available to cover the costs, as defined in section 502(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of direct loans or loan guarantees issued by the Department of Defense pursuant to the provisions of subchapter IV of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, pertaining to alternative means of acquiring and improving military family housing, military unaccompanied housing, and supporting facilities.

SEC. 121. None of the funds made available in this title may be obligated for Partnership for Peace Programs in the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union.

SEC. 122. (a) Not later than 60 days before issuing any solicitation for a contract with the private sector for military family housing the Secretary of the military department concerned shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress the notice described in subsection (b).

(b)(1) A notice referred to in subsection (a) is a notice of any guarantee (including the making of mortgage or rental payments) proposed to be made by the Secretary to the private party under the contract involved in the event of—

(A) the closure or realignment of the installation for which housing is provided under the contract;

(B) a reduction in force of units stationed at such installation; or

(C) the extended deployment overseas of units stationed at such installation.

(2) Each notice under this subsection shall specify the nature of the guarantee involved and assess the extent and likelihood, if any, of the liability of the Federal Government with respect to the guarantee.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 123. In addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, amounts may be transferred from the account established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), to the fund established by section 1013(d) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 3374) to pay for

expenses associated with the Homeowners Assistance Program. Any amounts transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the fund to which transferred.

SEC. 124. Notwithstanding this or any other provision of law, funds made available in this title for operation and maintenance of family housing shall be the exclusive source of funds for repair and maintenance of all family housing units, including general or flag officer quarters: *Provided*, That not more than \$35,000 per unit may be spent annually for the maintenance and repair of any general or flag officer quarters without 30 days prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress, except that an after-the-fact notification shall be submitted if the limitation is exceeded solely due to costs associated with environmental remediation that could not be reasonably anticipated at the time of the budget submission: *Provided further*, That the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) is to report annually to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress all operation and maintenance expenditures for each individual general or flag officer quarters for the prior fiscal year.

SEC. 125. None of the funds made available in this title under the heading "North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program", and no funds appropriated for any fiscal year before fiscal year 2006 for that program that remain available for obligation, may be obligated or expended for the conduct of studies of missile defense.

SEC. 126. Whenever the Secretary of Defense or any other official of the Department of Defense is requested by the subcommittee on Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives or the subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate to respond to a question or inquiry submitted by the chairman or another member of that subcommittee pursuant to a subcommittee hearing or other activity, the Secretary (or other official) shall respond to the request, in writing, within 21 days of the date on which the request is transmitted to the Secretary (or other official).

SEC. 127. Amounts contained in the Ford Island Improvement Account established by subsection (h) of section 2814 of title 10, United States Code, are appropriated and shall be available until expended for the purposes specified in subsection (i)(1) of such section or until transferred pursuant to subsection (i)(3) of such section.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 128. During the 5-year period after appropriations available to the Department of Defense for military construction and family housing operation and maintenance and construction have expired for obligation, upon a determination that such appropriations will not be necessary for the liquidation of obligations or for making authorized adjustments to such appropriations for obligations incurred during the period of availability of such appropriations, unobligated balances of such appropriations may be transferred into the appropriation, "Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Construction, Defense," to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and for the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred.

SEC. 129. None of the funds appropriated in this title available for the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS) or TRICARE shall be available for the reimbursement of any health care provider for inpatient mental health

service for care received when a patient is referred to a provider of inpatient mental health care or residential treatment care by a medical or health care professional having an economic interest in the facility to which the patient is referred: *Provided*, That this limitation does not apply in the case of inpatient mental health services provided under the program for persons with disabilities under subsection (d) of section 1079 of title 10, United States Code, provided as partial hospital care, or provided pursuant to a waiver authorized by the Secretary of Defense because of medical or psychological circumstances of the patient that are confirmed by a health professional who is not a Federal employee after a review, pursuant to rules prescribed by the Secretary, which takes into account the appropriate level of care for the patient, the intensity of services required by the patient, and the availability of that care.

SEC. 130. The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, may carry out a program to distribute surplus dental and medical equipment of the Department of Defense, at no cost to the Department of Defense, to Indian Health Service facilities and to federally-qualified health centers (within the meaning of section 1905(1)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(1)(2)(B))).

SEC. 131. None of the funds made available in this title may be used to carry out a military construction project, land acquisition, or family housing project for a military installation approved for closure in 2005 under the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note), and the Secretary of Defense may not transfer funds appropriated for such a military construction project, land acquisition, or family housing project to another account or use such funds for another purpose or project without the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

SEC. 132. None of the funds in this title for operation, maintenance, or repair of housing for general officers and flag officers in the National Capital Region may be used until the Department of Defense submits the report required by section 2802(c) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title I be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION
COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the payment of compensation benefits to or on behalf of veterans and a pilot program for disability examinations as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 107, chapters 11, 13, 18, 51, 53, 55, and 61); pension benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapters 15, 51, 53, 55, and 61; 92 Stat. 2508); and burial benefits, emergency and other officers' retirement pay, adjusted-service credits and certificates, payment of premiums due on commercial life insurance policies guaranteed under the provisions of title IV of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 540 et seq.) and for other

benefits as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 107, 1312, 1977, and 2106, chapters 23, 51, 53, 55, and 61; 43 Stat. 122, 123; 45 Stat. 735; 76 Stat. 1198), \$33,412,879,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$23,491,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be reimbursed to "General operating expenses" and "Medical services" for necessary expenses in implementing the provisions of chapters 51, 53, and 55 of title 38, United States Code, the funding source for which is specifically provided as the "Compensation and pensions" appropriation: *Provided further*, That such sums as may be earned on an actual qualifying patient basis, shall be reimbursed to "Medical facilities revolving fund" to augment the funding of individual medical facilities for nursing home care provided to pensioners as authorized.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY:

Page 31, line 1, relating to VA compensation and pensions, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$26,000,000)".

Page 34, line 21, relating to VA medical services, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$1,500,000,000)".

Page 36, line 9, relating to VA medical administration, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$500,000,000)".

Page 37, line 1, relating to VA medical facilities, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$300,000,000)".

Page 37, line 8, relating to VA medical and prosthetic research, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$67,000,000)".

Page 37, line 20, relating to VA general operating expense, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$11,000,000)".

Page 39, line 16, relating to major construction projects, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$150,000,000)".

Page 41, line 11, relating to minor construction projects, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$51,000,000)".

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

SEC. 409. In the case of taxpayers with an adjusted gross income in excess of \$1,000,000 for taxable year 2006, the amount of tax reduction resulting from the enactment of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 (Public Law 107-16) and the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-27) shall be reduced by 8.125 percent.

Mr. OBEY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, let me simply explain the amendment.

As I discussed earlier, under existing law given the tax cuts that the Congress has passed this year, persons making a million dollars or more will on average get a tax cuts of \$140,000. Meanwhile, we have a significant squeeze on veterans funding.

Very briefly, my amendment would simply scale back the size of those tax cuts from \$140,000 to \$129,000. It would use the \$2.6 billion saved by that action to add funding to a number of accounts for veterans health care. It would add \$1.5 billion more for medical services for returning veterans. It would add \$500 million more for increased medical administrative costs. It would add \$300 million to keep the VA medical facilities up and running by refurbishing them. It would add \$67 million for VA medical and prosthetic research; \$201 million to build medical clinics and long-term care facilities; and \$37 million for general administrative costs to assist veterans in receiving the prompt attention they deserve.

As has been indicated, the rule that was adopted precludes this amendment from being, or I should put it this way, the rule that is offered makes this amendment subject to a point of order. That means that it cannot be considered unless a point of order is not lodged against it.

I would hope that the majority would not lodge a point of order against it so that we might adjust so very slightly the tax cut for those who are already the most fortunate people in our society economically, and allow this money to be added for veterans health care.

I do not want to take any more of the House's time. I would simply urge an "aye" vote in the event that a point of order is not lodged against the amendment.

□ 1330

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation on an appropriations 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 does indeed change the application of existing law.

The gentleman from Wisconsin has served for many, many years with distinction on the Committee on Appropriations. He knows full well the powers of the Committee on Appropriations. This is not one of them. The ability to manipulate and change the Tax Code is not within our jurisdiction. So, Mr. Chairman, with that, I insist on the point of order and I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does anyone else wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the Budget Act, when it was passed several decades ago, was to force Congress to make trade-offs between different spending programs and between revenues and spending. The problem is that the way the Budget Act is being used these days, instead of forcing the Congress to face those trade-offs, the process is being segmented, thereby ena-

bling the House to avoid facing those trade-offs.

I think that is unfortunate because it prevents the House from making value judgments that would put veterans' health care, for instance, higher in our value structure than a \$140,000 tax cut for somebody making \$1 million.

I cannot deny that under the rules of the House, as they are being pursued under the Budget Act, this amendment is not in order. And so, Mr. Chairman, I regretfully concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded and sustained. The amendment is not in order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For the payment of readjustment and rehabilitation benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapters 21, 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 39, 51, 53, 55, and 61), \$3,214,246,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That expenses for rehabilitation program services and assistance which the Secretary is authorized to provide under section 3104(a) of title 38, United States Code, other than under subsection (a)(1), (2), (5), and (11) of that section, shall be charged to this account.

VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

For military and naval insurance, national service life insurance, servicemen's indemnities, service-disabled veterans insurance, and veterans mortgage life insurance as authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 19; 70 Stat. 887; 72 Stat. 487, \$45,907,000, to remain available until expended.

VETERANS HOUSING BENEFIT PROGRAM FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the program, as authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 37: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That during fiscal year 2005, within the resources available, not to exceed \$500,000 in gross obligations for direct loans are authorized for specially adapted housing loans.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, \$153,575,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "General operating expenses".

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, \$53,000, as authorized by chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds under this heading are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed \$4,242,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program, \$305,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "General operating expenses".

NATIVE AMERICAN VETERAN HOUSING LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program authorized by subchapter V of chapter 37 of title 38, United

States Code, \$580,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "General operating expenses": *Provided*, That no new loans in excess of \$30,000,000 may be made in fiscal year 2006.

GUARANTEED TRANSITIONAL HOUSING LOANS FOR HOMELESS VETERANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed transitional housing loan program authorized by subchapter VI of chapter 37, of title 38, United States Code, not to exceed \$750,000 of the amounts appropriated by this Act for "General operating expenses" and "Medical administration" may be expended.

VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION MEDICAL SERVICES

For necessary expenses for furnishing, as authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treatment to beneficiaries of the Department of Veterans Affairs and veterans described in section 1705(a) of title 38, United States Code, including care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Department, and including medical supplies and equipment and salaries and expenses of health-care employees hired under title 38, United States Code, and aid to State homes as authorized by section 1741 of title 38, United States Code; \$20,995,141,000, plus reimbursements, of which not less than \$2,200,000,000 shall be expended for specialty mental health care: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, not to exceed \$1,100,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2007: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall establish a priority for treatment for veterans who are service-connected disabled, lower income, or have special needs: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall give priority funding for the provision of basic medical benefits to veterans in enrollment priority groups 1 through 6: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may authorize the dispensing of prescription drugs from Veterans Health Administration facilities to enrolled veterans with privately written prescriptions based on requirements established by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That the implementation of the program described in the previous proviso shall incur no additional cost to the Department of Veterans Affairs: *Provided further*, That for the Department of Defense/Department of Veterans Affairs Health Care Sharing Incentive Fund, as authorized by section 721 of Public Law 107-314, a minimum of \$15,000,000, to remain available until expended, for the purposes authorized by section 8111 of title 38, United States Code.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses in the administration of the medical, hospital, nursing home, domiciliary, construction, supply, and research activities, as authorized by law; administrative expenses in support of capital policy activities; information technology hardware and software; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by sections 5901-5902 of title 5, United States Code; administrative and legal expenses of the Department for collecting and recovering amounts owed the Department as authorized under chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, and the Federal Medical Care Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 2651 et seq.); \$4,134,874,000, plus reimbursements, of which \$250,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2007.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

For necessary expenses for the maintenance and operation of hospitals, nursing

homes, and domiciliary facilities and other necessary facilities for the Veterans Health Administration; for administrative expenses in support of planning, design, project management, real property acquisition and disposition, construction and renovation of any facility under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department; for oversight, engineering and architectural activities not charged to project costs; for repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Department, not otherwise provided for, either by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and purchase of materials; for leases of facilities; and for laundry and food services, \$3,297,669,000, plus reimbursements, of which \$250,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2007.

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

For necessary expenses in carrying out programs of medical and prosthetic research and development as authorized by chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, to remain available until September 30, 2007, \$393,000,000, plus reimbursements.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary operating expenses of the Department of Veterans Affairs, not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses in support of Department-wide capital planning, management and policy activities, uniforms or allowances therefor; not to exceed \$25,000 for official reception and representation expenses; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, and the Department of Defense for the cost of overseas employee mail, \$1,411,827,000: *Provided*, That expenses for services and assistance authorized under paragraphs (1), (2), (5), and (11) of section 3104(a) of title 38, United States Code, that the Secretary determines are necessary to enable entitled veterans: (1) to the maximum extent feasible, to become employable and to obtain and maintain suitable employment; or (2) to achieve maximum independence in daily living, shall be charged to this account: *Provided further*, That the Veterans Benefits Administration shall be funded at not less than \$1,086,938,000: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, not to exceed \$70,000,000 shall be available for obligation until September 30, 2007: *Provided further*, That from the funds made available under this heading, the Veterans Benefits Administration may purchase up to two passenger motor vehicles for use in operations of that Administration in Manila, Philippines.

NATIONAL CEMETERY ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of the National Cemetery Administration for operations and maintenance, not otherwise provided for, including uniforms or allowances therefor; cemeterial expenses as authorized by law; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for use in cemeterial operations; and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$156,447,000: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, not to exceed \$7,800,000 shall be available until September 30, 2007.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, \$70,174,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007.

CONSTRUCTION, MAJOR PROJECTS

For constructing, altering, extending and improving any of the facilities including parking projects under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Af-

fairs, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 316, 2404, 2406, 8102, 8103, 8106, 8108, 8109, 8110, and 8122 of title 38, United States Code, including planning, architectural and engineering services, maintenance or guarantee period services costs associated with equipment guarantees provided under the project, services of claims analysts, offsite utility and storm drainage system construction costs, and site acquisition, where the estimated cost of a project is more than the amount set forth in section 8104(a)(3)(A) of title 38, United States Code, or where funds for a project were made available in a previous major project appropriation, \$607,100,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$532,010,000 shall be for Capital Asset Realignment for Enhanced Services (CARES) activities; and of which \$8,091,000 shall be to make reimbursements as provided in section 13 of the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 (41 U.S.C. 612) for claims paid for contract disputes: *Provided*, That except for advance planning activities, including needs assessments which may or may not lead to capital investments, and other capital asset management related activities, such as portfolio development and management activities, and investment strategy studies funded through the advance planning fund and the planning and design activities funded through the design fund and CARES funds, including needs assessments which may or may not lead to capital investments, none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be used for any project which has not been approved by the Congress in the budgetary process: *Provided further*, That funds provided in this appropriation for fiscal year 2006, for each approved project (except those for CARES activities referenced above) shall be obligated: (1) by the awarding of a construction documents contract by September 30, 2006; and (2) by the awarding of a construction contract by September 30, 2007: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall promptly report in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate any approved major construction project in which obligations are not incurred within the time limitations established above.

CONSTRUCTION, MINOR PROJECTS

For constructing, altering, extending, and improving any of the facilities including parking projects under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including planning and assessments of needs which may lead to capital investments, architectural and engineering services, maintenance or guarantee period services costs associated with equipment guarantees provided under the project, services of claims analysts, offsite utility and storm drainage system construction costs, and site acquisition, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 316, 2404, 2406, 8102, 8103, 8106, 8108, 8109, 8110, 8122, and 8162 of title 38, United States Code, where the estimated cost of a project is equal to or less than the amount set forth in section 8104(a)(3)(A) of title 38, United States Code, \$208,937,000, to remain available until expended, along with unobligated balances of previous "Construction, minor projects" appropriations which are hereby made available for any project where the estimated cost is equal to or less than the amount set forth in such section, of which \$160,000,000 shall be for Capital Asset Realignment for Enhanced Services (CARES) activities: *Provided*, That funds in this account shall be available for: (1) repairs to any of the nonmedical facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department which are necessary because of loss or damage caused by any natural disaster or catas-

trophe; and (2) temporary measures necessary to prevent or to minimize further loss by such causes.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES

For grants to assist States to acquire or construct State nursing home and domiciliary facilities and to remodel, modify or alter existing hospital, nursing home and domiciliary facilities in State homes, for furnishing care to veterans as authorized by sections 8131-8137 of title 38, United States Code, \$25,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GRANTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF STATE VETERANS CEMETERIES

For grants to aid States in establishing, expanding, or improving State veterans cemeteries as authorized by section 2408 of title 38, United States Code, \$32,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 201. Any appropriation for fiscal year 2006 for "Compensation and pensions", "Readjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemnities" may be transferred to any other of the mentioned appropriations.

SEC. 202. Appropriations available in this title for salaries and expenses shall be available for services authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, hire of passenger motor vehicles; lease of a facility or land or both; and uniforms or allowances therefore, as authorized by sections 5901-5902 of such title.

SEC. 203. No appropriations in this title (except the appropriations for "Construction, major projects", and "Construction, minor projects") shall be available for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home.

SEC. 204. No appropriations in this title shall be available for hospitalization or examination of any persons (except beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits to veterans, and persons receiving such treatment under sections 7901-7904 of title 5, United States Code or the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.)), unless reimbursement of cost is made to the "Medical services" account at such rates as may be fixed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

SEC. 205. Appropriations available in this title for "Compensation and pensions", "Readjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemnities" shall be available for payment of prior year accrued obligations required to be recorded by law against the corresponding prior year accounts within the last quarter of fiscal year 2005.

SEC. 206. Appropriations available in this title shall be available to pay prior year obligations of corresponding prior year appropriations accounts resulting from sections 3328(a), 3334, and 3712(a) of title 31, United States Code, except that if such obligations are from trust fund accounts they shall be payable from "Compensation and pensions".

SEC. 207. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during fiscal year 2006, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, from the National Service Life Insurance Fund (38 U.S.C. 1920), the Veterans' Special Life Insurance Fund (38 U.S.C. 1923), and the United States Government Life Insurance Fund (38 U.S.C. 1955), reimburse the "General operating expenses" account for the cost of administration of the insurance programs financed through those accounts: *Provided*, That reimbursement shall be made only from the surplus earnings accumulated in an insurance program in fiscal year 2006 that are available for dividends in that program after claims have been paid and actuarially determined reserves have been set aside: *Provided*

further, That if the cost of administration of an insurance program exceeds the amount of surplus earnings accumulated in that program, reimbursement shall be made only to the extent of such surplus earnings: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall determine the cost of administration for fiscal year 2006 which is properly allocable to the provision of each insurance program and to the provision of any total disability income insurance included in such insurance program.

SEC. 208. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Department of Veterans Affairs shall continue the Franchise Fund pilot program authorized to be established by section 403 of Public Law 103-356 until October 1, 2006: *Provided*, That the Franchise Fund, established by title I of Public Law 104-204 to finance the operations of the Franchise Fund pilot program, shall continue until October 1, 2006.

SEC. 209. Amounts deducted from enhanced-use lease proceeds to reimburse an account for expenses incurred by that account during a prior fiscal year for providing enhanced-use lease services, may be obligated during the fiscal year in which the proceeds are received.

SEC. 210. Funds available in this title or funds for salaries and other administrative expenses shall also be available to reimburse the Office of Resolution Management and the Office of Employment Discrimination Complaint Adjudication for all services provided at rates which will recover actual costs but not exceed \$29,758,000 for the Office of Resolution Management and \$3,059,000 for the Office of Employment and Discrimination Complaint Adjudication: *Provided*, That payments may be made in advance for services to be furnished based on estimated costs: *Provided further*, That amounts received shall be credited to "General operating expenses" for use by the office that provided the service.

SEC. 211. No appropriations in this title shall be available to enter into any new lease of real property if the estimated annual rental is more than \$300,000 unless the Secretary submits a report which the Committees on Appropriations of the Congress approve within 30 days following the date on which the report is received.

SEC. 212. No funds of the Department of Veterans Affairs shall be available for hospital care, nursing home care, or medical services provided to any person under chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, for a non-service-connected disability described in section 1729(a)(2) of such title, unless that person has disclosed to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in such form as the Secretary may require, current, accurate third-party reimbursement information for purposes of section 1729 of such title: *Provided*, That the Secretary may recover, in the same manner as any other debt due the United States, the reasonable charges for such care or services from any person who does not make such disclosure as required: *Provided further*, That any amounts so recovered for care or services provided in a prior fiscal year may be obligated by the Secretary during the fiscal year in which amounts are received.

SEC. 213. None of the funds made available to the Department of Veterans Affairs in this Act, or any other Act, may be used to implement sections 2 and 5 of Public Law 107-287 and section 303 of Public Law 108-422.

SEC. 214. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, at the discretion of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, proceeds or revenues derived from enhanced-use leasing activities (including disposal) may be deposited into the "Construction, major projects" and "Construction, minor projects" accounts and be used for construction (including site acquisition and disposition), alterations and

improvements of any medical facility under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs. Such sums as realized are in addition to the amount provided for in "Construction, major projects" and "Construction, minor projects".

SEC. 215. Amounts made available under "Medical services" are available—

(1) for furnishing recreational facilities, supplies, and equipment; and

(2) for funeral expenses, burial expenses, and other expenses incidental to funerals and burials for beneficiaries receiving care in the Department.

SEC. 216. That such sums as may be deposited to the Medical Care Collections Fund pursuant to section 1729A of title 38, United States Code, may be transferred to "Medical services", to remain available until expended for the purposes of this account.

SEC. 217. Amounts made available for fiscal year 2006 under the "Medical services", "Medical administration", and "Medical facilities" accounts may be transferred between the accounts to the extent necessary to implement the restructuring of the Veterans Health Administration accounts after notice of the amount and purpose of the transfer is provided to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives and a period of 30 days has elapsed: *Provided*, That the limitation on transfers is 20 percent in fiscal year 2006.

SEC. 218. Any appropriation for fiscal year 2006 for the Veterans Benefits Administration made available under the heading "General operating expenses" may be transferred to the "Veterans Housing Benefit Program Fund Program Account" for the purpose of providing funds for the nationwide property management contract if the administrative costs of such contract exceed \$8,800,000 in the budget year.

SEC. 219. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs (Secretary) shall allow veterans eligible under existing VA Medical Care requirements and who reside in Alaska to obtain medical care services from medical facilities supported by the Indian Health Services or tribal organizations. The Secretary shall: (1) limit the application of this provision to rural Alaskan veterans in areas where an existing VA facility or VA-contracted service is unavailable; (2) require participating veterans and facilities to comply with all appropriate rules and regulations, as established by the Secretary; (3) require this provision to be consistent with CARES; and (4) result in no additional cost to the Department of Veterans Affairs or the Indian Health Service.

SEC. 220. That such sums as may be deposited to the Department of Veterans Affairs Capital Asset Fund pursuant to section 8118 of title 38, United States Code, may be transferred to the "Construction, major projects" and "Construction, minor projects" accounts, to remain available until expended for the purposes of these accounts.

SEC. 221. None of the funds available to the Department of Veterans Affairs in this Act, or any other Act, may be used by the Department of Veterans Affairs to implement a national standardized contract for diabetes monitoring systems.

TITLE III

RELATED AGENCIES

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the American Battle Monuments Commission, including the acquisition of land or interest in land in foreign countries; purchases and repair of uniforms for caretakers of national cemeteries and monu-

ments outside of the United States and its territories and possessions; rent of office and garage space in foreign countries; purchase (one for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$7,500 for official reception and representation expenses; and insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries, when required by law of such countries, \$35,750,000, to remain available until expended.

FOREIGN CURRENCY FLUCTUATIONS ACCOUNT

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the American Battle Monuments Commission, \$15,250,000, to remain available until expended, for purposes authorized by section 2109 of title 36, United States Code.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims as authorized by sections 7251-7298 of title 38, United States Code, \$18,295,000, of which \$1,260,000 shall be available for the purpose of providing financial assistance as described, and in accordance with the process and reporting procedures set forth, under this heading in Public Law 102-229.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

CEMETERIAL EXPENSES, ARMY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by law, for maintenance, operation, and improvement of Arlington National Cemetery and Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery, including the purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$29,550,000, to remain available until expended. In addition, such sums as may be necessary for parking maintenance, repairs and replacement, to be derived from the Lease of Department of Defense Real Property for Defense Agencies account.

ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME

For expenses necessary for the Armed Forces Retirement Home to operate and maintain the Armed Forces Retirement Home—Washington and the Armed Forces Retirement Home—Gulfport, to be paid from funds available in the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund, \$58,281,000, of which \$1,248,000 shall remain available until expended for construction and renovation of the physical plants at the Armed Forces Retirement Home—Washington and the Armed Forces Retirement Home—Gulfport.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 402. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used, directly or through grants, to pay or to provide reimbursement for payment of the salary of a consultant (whether retained by the Federal Government or a grantee) at more than the daily equivalent of the rate paid for level IV of the Executive Schedule, unless specifically authorized by law.

SEC. 403. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2006 pay raises for programs funded by this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act.

SEC. 404. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for any program, project, or activity, when it is made known to the Federal entity or official to which the funds are made available that the program,

project, or activity is not in compliance with any Federal law relating to risk assessment, the protection of private property rights, or unfunded mandates.

SEC. 405. No part of any funds appropriated in this Act shall be used by an agency of the executive branch, other than for normal and recognized executive-legislative relationships, for publicity or propaganda purposes, and for the preparation, distribution or use of any kit, pamphlet, booklet, publication, radio, television or film presentation designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress, except in presentation to Congress itself.

SEC. 406. All departments and agencies funded under this Act are encouraged, within the limits of the existing statutory authorities and funding, to expand their use of "E-Commerce" technologies and procedures in the conduct of their business practices and public service activities.

SEC. 407. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriations Act.

SEC. 408. Unless stated otherwise, all reports and notifications required by this Act shall be submitted to the Subcommittee on Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

Mr. WALSH (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 54, line 13, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD and open to any amendment at this point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. JONES OF OHIO

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. JONES of Ohio: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. 4 ____ . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to implement the results of the 2005 round of base closures and realignments until the completion of all environmental remediation associated with the closure of military installations approved for closure in the 1995 round of base closures and realignments.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I intend to withdraw this amendment, but what I wanted to have in the RECORD before I do the withdrawal is the fact that in many of the prior base closures there are still environmental issues that have not been addressed, that have not been remedied; and we really need to take a look at that as we go through the next round to make sure that the dollars we have allocated and the closures we have put in place under BRAC have been taken care of.

Mr. Chairman, in order to ensure the movement of this legislation through

the house, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. JONES OF OHIO

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. JONES of Ohio: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. 4 ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to close or realign any military installation approved for closure or realignment in 2005 before the Secretary of Defense makes the information available upon which the Secretary's closure and realignment recommendations were based, as required by section 2903(c)(4) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note).

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the gentlewoman's amendment.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to the Subcommittee on Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations, which would require that all information used by the Secretary of Defense to implement its current base closing recommendations be released to Congress, the public, and the BRAC Commission before any actions on base closings can take place.

Mr. Chairman, first things first. Why are we proposing base closures during a time of war? This BRAC round should be delayed until the following actions can be completed: recommendations of the review of overseas military structures are implemented by the Secretary of Defense, a substantial number of American troops returned from Iraq, the House and the Senate Committee on Armed Services receive the Quadrennial Defense Review, the National Maritime Security Strategy is implemented, and the Homeland Defense and Civil Support Directive is implemented.

In addition, all information used by the Secretary to determine base closings should be released to the Congress and the American public. It is important these be addressed before implementing the BRAC process because once a base is closed, it can never be reopened.

Mr. Chairman, in the 11th Congressional District and in northeast Ohio, over 1,100 jobs will be lost due to the BRAC process. These job losses will have a tremendous economic impact on the City of Cleveland, which has been named the most impoverished city in the country. Now is simply not the time for BRAC, in Cleveland or around the country.

Mr. Chairman, I realize the importance of the BRAC process; however, I feel that all information should be released in order for communities to prepare adequate defense tactics for future hearings. Now is simply not the time for BRAC.

I commend my colleagues, the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH) and Senator THUNE for introducing legislation to address this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment.

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

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Ohio has changed the language to comply with the existing legislation, so I have no objection to it, and I withdraw my reservation of the point of order.

□ 1345

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

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to rise in support of the Jones amendment. I think the gentlewoman is right on point here. I know for my base, in this case Fort Monmouth, we have not received a lot of the data, most of the data upon which the Pentagon's recommendations were made. I think that was quite clear if you listen to the hearings that were held last week by the BRAC. Many of the commissioners at that time indicated they did not have the background data upon which the Pentagon's recommendations were made.

I think this is just another indication of the fact that we have not been able to proceed with this BRAC round in the way we have in the past. I have actually been through three other BRAC rounds since I have been in the Congress; and just from the questioning that occurred last week at the BRAC hearings from the commissioners, it was clear this is not the time to have a BRAC round.

We are in the middle of a war, both in Iraq and in Afghanistan. Many of the commissioners asked questions about the war and the military value because they frankly felt that in a general sense questions had not been answered by the Pentagon, and the Pentagon was not able to answer the questions properly about how this BRAC round was supposed to proceed in the context of an ongoing war.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I am so pleased that Senator SNOWE is offering a similar piece of legislation in the Senate with regard to data information on specific projects. I thank all of my colleagues for coming to the floor to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time in the name of the people of the 11th Congressional District of Ohio.

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Jones amendment today because it gives this House another opportunity to slow the process down. We did not take that opportunity last night in

support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY), despite the compelling testimony offered by a number of Members about the fact that we still have a lot of information outlying that should come to us within the upcoming months, within the year, including the Quadrennial Defense Review, that would actually help the BRAC commissioners to evaluate the DOD's recommendations for those installations that they have submitted on a list for recommendations of closure and realignment.

But the Jones amendment says, okay, if we are not going to do that, if we are not going to postpone the BRAC rounds to get all of the information from the overseas base closures, from the QDR, getting troops home from Iraq and Afghanistan, dealing with the maritime issues, dealing with homeland defense and civil support directives, then let us at least say in fairness and for a process that should be open and transparent as opposed to emulating litigation discovery processes here, give us the information as Members of Congress, the task force and the communities, the commissioners now that are supposed to be evaluating these recommendations.

How can we expect them to do that in a process that is supposed to be open and transparent, when piecemeal by piecemeal the Department of Defense is releasing this information as opposed to releasing it in a more comprehensive way, as was done in the last BRAC round in 1995?

Let me give an example. Last night right before we voted on the Bradley amendment, we received word, the offices for South Dakota here and over in the Senate and in the community of Rapid City, that the Department of Defense had just released some additional information.

Here we thought we have what we need to start assessing and evaluating these recommendations. Most of this information had already been released. We have less than 10 percent of what we need. Less than 10 percent of what we need, just a couple of weeks out from our regional hearing to begin evaluating what drove the Department of Defense's evaluation to rank Ellsworth Air Force Base the way they did, and how they applied the criteria.

We cannot make our case, and there are people in Rapid City, South Dakota, with the task force in support of Ellsworth Air Force Base that have been working for years in anticipation of this day, and we are not willing to slow this process down enough to get adequate and comprehensive information from the Department of Defense?

It is clear that either they were so under the gun to meet the deadline of May 13 that they did not adequately plan or have enough time to determine what it was that was going to have to be classified or declassified before releasing the information, either in the aggregate or installation by installation.

If the reason for that is primarily for national security reasons because we are at war, that justifies slowing this process down at least a little bit so the Department of Defense is forced to release this information that we have had in past BRAC rounds so it is in fairness to the communities and really faithful to the BRAC process which is to be open and transparent and allow communities to make their best case before the commissioners prior to the site reviews, prior to the regional hearings.

I encourage my colleagues, while Members may have had reservations last night, to postpone the BRAC round awaiting all of the other information. Can we not at least slow it down enough to ensure that the Department of Defense is accountable to each and every one of us and our constituents and our military installations to get that information to ensure a fair, open, and transparent process? I hope Members will agree and support the Jones amendment.

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

I just wanted to comment on what the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH) said. In the last BRAC round in 1995, we had all of the information to back up the Pentagon's recommendations within a few days. It is almost 2 weeks now since the base closure list came out. I think it was the Friday before last.

As the gentlewoman mentioned, we are still lacking most of the background information for these recommendations.

For example, in the case of Fort Monmouth, which is represented by me and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), the recommendation says that to close Fort Monmouth and move it would cost \$822 million and that over the next 6 years, annually, there would be a savings of about \$143 million.

We do not have the background information that the Pentagon used to make those kinds of number-crunching decisions. The number-crunchers have not given us that kind of information. How are we supposed to prepare for a site visit next week, or regional hearings in early July, without having that information?

It is simply inappropriate, and it certainly has not been the case in the past. I have been through three previous BRAC rounds, and that was never the case. That is why the Jones amendment is so important. And particularly when the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) references military value, this is all about military value.

In the case of Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, we are an electronics and communications command for the Army. We basically back up the soldier in the field with equipment that is electronic or related communications. Our point that we have been trying to make is if you close Fort Monmouth over the next few years, that commander in the

field who might need some communications or electronics equipment in the next few days or the next few weeks will not have access to it because Fort Monmouth is in the process of moving and people will not be available to do what is necessary for the soldier in the field.

How can the Pentagon make recommendations and not take that into mind? We have no indication of how they address that issue because we do not have the backup data. That is why this amendment is important. I urge my colleagues on a bipartisan basis to support it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to elaborate very briefly on the preceding remarks. We are talking about a time when men and women are risking their lives in the field, facing roadside bombs and mortar fire from insurgents. They need help and support from back here in the United States, from our bases, from places such as, as my colleague from New Jersey was talking about, Fort Monmouth, for example.

We are not looking so much for the data on what is the implication of base closing and realignment on local economies. We are looking for the data on how the Pentagon intends to provide for the needs of the men and women in the field today, tomorrow and next year, how they will make up for any loss of capability that results from realignment and transfer of personnel.

In order to have a conscientious evaluation of what is being proposed here, we need the data. It is as simple as that. I applaud the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) for offering this amendment and demanding that we get the information that we need to do our job.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TIAHRT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TIAHRT:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to promulgate regulations without consideration of the effect of such regulations on the competitiveness of American businesses.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) reserves a point of order.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, in this legislation, the Military Quality of Life and VA appropriations, much of the work, especially for construction and maintenance, are governed by rules and regulations. A good example of the problem this can create occurred in Wichita, Kansas, not too long ago

when OSHA targeted the Wichita area building and construction industry.

Through the threat of citations and fines, they literally shut down all of the work going on in the area of home building. What I did was go back to the Wichita area and I met with OSHA and the area home builders, and I found out they both had the same goal. That goal was to see that the workplace was safe. So by bringing them together, they worked out an agreement that they would work together, instead of assessing fines and citations, and create a better work environment, a safe work environment, and they were successful.

Only recently have I found that the OSHA department here in Washington wants to renege on that agreement and can no longer sustain the concept of working together to have a safe workplace. Instead, they are going to continue on an adversarial relationship. That brings me to the point that I want to stress with this amendment, and that is if we would work together, the Federal Government and the private sector, we could be much more successful in achieving the goals that both want.

Mr. Chairman, less regulation and working together means granting the freedom to allow Americans to pursue their dreams. It also provides the space for businesses to thrive and create more jobs. Regulations promulgated by the Federal Government often become a creeping ivy of regulations that strangle enterprise. The unrealistic and impractical environment that OSHA mandates create are literally driving our industries and small businesses and our health care system to a grinding halt.

How can we expect our economy to develop and grow when bureaucracy prevents businesses from starting and expanding. It is estimated today that the total regulatory burden is about \$350 billion a year. That is \$350 billion that could go toward creating more jobs instead of stifling growth.

As we approve spending allocations on this bill and other bills, we need to remind regulators about the importance of their actions with that funding.

Regulations can help create jobs or strangle them. Each and every Federal agency should take into consideration the effect of proposed policies on competitiveness of United States business. Each agency should be held accountable for those effects.

Other countries are preparing for tomorrow's economy. Countries like Ireland are reducing regulations, working hand in hand with businesses. They have lowered their taxes, and they have changed their educational system to prepare their workers to be part of a technical economy.

□ 1400

We are working in the opposite direction.

My concern, Mr. Chairman, is that we are going to be a third-rate econ-

omy within 10 to 20 years if we do not change the environment that helps us keep and create jobs. That means having some common-sense regulations that work with our industries instead of against them.

Mr. Chairman, I have complete confidence that Chairman WALSH is going to be working together with us to make a better America, a more competitive America and to prepare us for the economy, because we all know that if we do not, we are going to have a third-rate economy.

With that hope in mind, I am going to respectfully withdraw my amendment.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. This is my last opportunity to express some remarks on the Military Quality of Life Appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my disappointment with the amount of funding in this bill for our Nation's veterans. As we enter the Memorial Day weekend, I am concerned that the funding levels for veterans' health will not allow us to keep up with the current demand for services, let alone meet the needs of the thousands of new veterans who are returning from Iraq and Afghanistan.

Eighteen young soldiers have been killed in south Texas, which is where I was born and raised and that I represent, and many, many more have been injured. One of my constituents, Sergeant Nieves Rodriguez, Jr., is lying in a bed at Walter Reed Hospital right now. He has lost an arm and the doctors are fighting to save his leg. He is going to need months of therapy, expensive prosthetics and years of follow-up care. He is only one of thousands in similar situations.

Proponents of this legislation claim it increases veterans' health funding by \$1 billion, but in fact, funds are just being shifted from other veterans' accounts. The real increase is a mere \$700 million, not enough to meet inflation and mandated salary increases. I would have supported the Obey amendment that would add \$2.6 billion for veterans' health care, but the amendment was not made in order.

Mr. Chairman, this funding would have allowed us to care for our returning veterans and meet current shortfalls. Although I will support the final bill, I urge the committee to find a way to increase funding for veterans' health.

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

Mr. Chairman, as we draw to a close, I again want to take this time to congratulate, salute and thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) for his leadership in this, the first product of the new Military Quality of Life and

Veterans Affairs Subcommittee on Appropriations. It has been a professional process, a thorough process, a respectful one and a bipartisan one, exactly the manner in which I think the people of this country would want us to deal with the important business of providing quality of life, training and other programs and facilities for our servicemen and -women, military retirees and veterans.

I want to thank the minority staff, Bob Bonner and Tom Forhan, for their leadership. I want to thank the professional staff on the majority side, led by the very able Carol Murphy, with a tremendous staff, for their great work. All of this would not have been possible today and the good work that is in this bill would not have been possible today without the genuine cooperation and great leadership of the chairman, and I thank him.

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

I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from Texas regarding our staff. They have done a remarkable job. This is a brand-new structure. The leadership of the committee, the chairman, Chief Clerk Frank Cushing, helped us to organize the staff and they gave us the best people they could give us. I am very proud of the work product that they have provided us with and the support that they have given us along the way.

Again, I credit the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), who has been a pleasure to work with. His knowledge of the military has helped me a great deal to get up to speed on these issues. I have a lot more to learn, but I look forward to working with him as we complete this bill after House passage and the conference with the Senate.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MELANCON), amendment No. 2 offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MELANCON

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MELANCON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 213, noes 214, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 224]

AYES—213

Abercrombie Gordon
 Ackerman Green (WI)
 Allen Green, Al
 Andrews Green, Gene
 Baca Grijalva
 Baird Gutierrez
 Baldwin Hall
 Barrow Harman
 Bean Hastings (FL)
 Becerra Herseth
 Berkley Higgins
 Berman Hinchey
 Berry Hinojosa
 Bishop (GA) Holden
 Bishop (NY) Holt
 Blumenauer Honda
 Boren Hoolley
 Boswell Hoyer
 Boucher Insee
 Boyd Israel
 Brady (PA) Jackson (IL)
 Brown (OH) Jackson-Lee
 Brown, Corrine (TX)
 Butterfield Jefferson
 Capito Jones (NC)
 Capps Jones (OH)
 Capuano Kanjorski
 Cardin Kaptur
 Cardoza Kennedy (MN)
 Carnahan Kennedy (RI)
 Carson Kildee
 Case Kilpatrick (MI)
 Chandler Kind
 Clay Kucinich
 Cleaver Langevin
 Clyburn Lantos
 Conyers Larsen (WA)
 Cooper Larson (CT)
 Costa Leach
 Costello Lee
 Crowley Levin
 Cuellar Lewis (GA)
 Cummings Lipinski
 Davis (AL) Lofgren, Zoe
 Davis (CA) Lowey
 Davis (FL) Lynch
 Davis (IL) Maloney
 Davis (TN) Markey
 Davis, Jo Ann Marshall
 DeFazio Matheson
 DeGette Matsui
 Delahunt McCarthy
 DeLauro McCollum (MN)
 Dent McDermott
 Dicks McGovern
 Dingell McIntyre
 Doggett McKinney
 Edwards McNulty
 Emanuel Meehan
 Engel Meek (FL)
 Eshoo Meeks (NY)
 Etheridge Melancon
 Evans Michaud
 Farr Miller (NC)
 Fattah Miller, George
 Fitzpatrick (PA) Moore (KS)
 Ford Moore (WI)
 Fossella Moran (VA)
 Frank (MA) Nadler
 Gerlach Napolitano
 Gibbons Neal (MA)
 Gonzalez Oberstar

NOES—214

Aderholt Bradley (NH)
 Akin Brady (TX)
 Alexander Brown (SC)
 Bachus Brown-Waite,
 Baker Ginny
 Barrett (SC) Burgess
 Bartlett (MD) Burton (IN)
 Barton (TX) Buyer
 Bass Calvert
 Beauprez Camp
 Biggert Cannon
 Bilirakis Cantor
 Bishop (UT) Carter
 Blackburn Castle
 Blunt Chabot
 Boehlert Chocola
 Boehner Coble
 Bonilla Cole (OK)
 Bonner Conaway
 Bono Cox
 Boozman Cramer
 Boustany Crenshaw

Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gallegly
 Garrett (NJ)
 Gilchrest
 Gillmor
 Gingrey
 Gohmert
 Goode
 Goodlatte
 Granger
 Graves
 Gutknecht
 Harris
 Hart
 Hastert
 Hayes
 Hayworth
 Hefley
 Hensarling
 Herger
 Hobson
 Hoekstra
 Hostettler
 Hulshof
 Hunter
 Hyde
 Inglis (SC)
 Issa
 Istook
 Jenkins
 Jindal
 Johnson (CT)
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, Sam
 Keller
 Kelly
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kirk
 Kline
 Knollenberg
 Kolbe
 Kuhl (NY)
 LaHood
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Lewis (CA)

NOT VOTING—7
 Doyle
 Emerson
 Filner

□ 1432

Messrs. BILIRAKIS, GINGREY, TOM DAVIS of Virginia, and SIMMONS, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. WYNN, FRANK of Massachusetts, PETERSON of Minnesota, DICKS, HALL, REYES, PASTOR, BISHOP of Georgia, SABO, DOGGETT, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:
 Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 224, on the Melancon Amendment, I was in my Congressional District on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 171, noes 254, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 225]

AYES—171

Abercrombie Grijalva
 Ackerman Gutierrez
 Allen Hall
 Andrews Harman
 Baca Hastings (FL)
 Baird Higgins
 Baldwin Hinchey
 Barrow Hinojosa
 Bean Holt
 Beauprez Honda
 Becerra Hoolley
 Berkley Insee
 Berman Israel
 Bishop (NY) Jackson (IL)
 Blumenauer Jackson-Lee
 Boswell (TX)
 Brady (PA) Jefferson
 Brown (OH) Johnson (IL)
 Brown, Corrine Jones (OH)
 Butterfield Kaptur
 Capps Kildee
 Capuano Kilpatrick (MI)
 Cardin Kind
 Cardoza Kucinich
 Carnahan Langevin
 Carson Lantos
 Case Larson (CT)
 Chandler Lee
 Clay Lewis (GA)
 Cleaver Lipinski
 Clyburn Lofgren, Zoe
 Conyers Lowey
 Costa Lynch
 Costello Maloney
 Crowley Manzullo
 Cummings Markey
 Davis (IL) Matheson
 Davis, Jo Ann Matsui
 DeFazio McCarthy
 DeGette McCollum (MN)
 Delahunt McDermott
 DeLauro McGovern
 Dingell McKinney
 Doggett McNulty
 Edwards Meehan
 Ehlers Meek (FL)
 Emanuel Meeks (NY)
 Engel Melancon
 Eshoo Miller (NC)
 Etheridge Miller, Gary
 Evans Miller, George
 Farr Moore (KS)
 Fattah Moore (WI)
 Ford Moran (VA)
 Gingrey Nadler
 Gonzalez Napolitano
 Gordon Neal (MA)
 Green, Al Oberstar

NOES—254

Aderholt Boustany
 Akin Boyd
 Alexander Bradley (NH)
 Bachus Brady (TX)
 Baker Brown (SC)
 Barrett (SC) Brown-Waite,
 Bartlett (MD) Ginny
 Barton (TX) Burgess
 Bass Burton (IN)
 Berry Buyer
 Biggert Calvert
 Bilirakis Camp
 Bishop (GA) Cannon
 Bishop (UT) Cantor
 Blackburn Capito
 Blunt Carter
 Boehlert Castle
 Boehner Chabot
 Bonilla Chocola
 Bonner Coble
 Bono Cole (OK)
 Boozman Conaway
 Boren Cooper
 Boucher Cramer

Crenshaw
 Cubin
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Cunningham
 Davis (AL)
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (FL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis (TN)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeLay
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Doolittle
 Drake
 Dreier
 Duncan
 English (PA)
 Everett
 Feeney

Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Harris
Hart
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)

LaHood
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Marchant
Marshall
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pastor
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad

Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR) having assumed the chair, Mr. BASS, 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. 2528) making appropriations for military quality of life functions of the Department of Defense, military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 298, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment. The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 425, nays 1, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 226]
YEAS—425

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Billirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny

Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchee
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey

Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Rangel
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8
Cox
Doyle
Emerson
Filner
Hastings (WA)
Johnson, E. B.
Menendez
Millender-
McDonald

□ 1441

Mr. HALL and Mr. SCHIFF changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 225, on the Blumenauer Amendment, I was in my Congressional District on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the last two lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the “Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, 2006”.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

NAYS—1
Stark

NOT VOTING—7

Doyle	Hastings (WA)	Millender-
Emerson	Johnson, E. B.	McDonald
Filner	Menendez	

1501

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 226 on H.R. 2528, I was in my Congressional District on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, JUNE 3, 2005 TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT, 2006

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight, June 3, 2005, to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

PERMISSION FOR THE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, JUNE 3, 2005 TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON H.R. 2475, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence may have until midnight, June 3, 2005 to file a privileged report on the bill, H.R. 2475, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR REDACTION OF MISSTATEMENT FROM CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, today I made a factual statement about Secretary Rumsfeld. I later corrected myself. But to ensure against the possibility that the initial misstatement might be viewed out of context with the correction, I ask unanimous consent to redact my initial reference to Secretary Rumsfeld and the statement of correction from the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING H.R. 2475, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to all Members of the House that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has ordered the bill, H.R. 2475, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006, reported favorably to the House with an amendment. The committee's report will be filed next week under the unanimous consent just agreed to.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to announce that the classified Schedule of Authorizations and the classified Annex accompanying the bill will be available for review by Members at the offices of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in Room H-405 of the Capitol beginning any time after the report is filed. The committee office will be open during regular business hours for the convenience of any Member who wishes to review this material prior to its consideration by the House. I anticipate that H.R. 2475 will be considered on the floor of the House the first week after the recess.

I recommend that Members wishing to review the classified Annex contact the committee's Director of Security to arrange a time and date for that viewing. This will assure the availability of committee staff to assist Members who desire assistance during their review of these classified materials.

I urge interested Members to review these materials in order to better understand the committee's recommendation. The classified Annex to the committee's report contains the committee's recommendations on the intelligence budget for Fiscal Year 2006 and related classified information that cannot be disclosed publicly.

It is important that Members keep in mind the requirements of clause 13 of House rule XXIII, which only permits access to classified information by those Members of the House who have signed the oath provided for in the rule. Members are advised that it will be necessary to bring a copy of the rule XXIII oath signed by them when they come to the committee offices to review the material.

If a Member has not yet signed the oath, but wishes to review the classified Annex and Schedule of Authorizations, the committee staff can administer the oath and see to it that the executed form is sent to the Clerk's office.

In addition, the committee's rules require that Members agree in writing to a nondisclosure agreement. The agreement indicates that the Member has

been granted access to the classified Annex and that they are familiar with the rules of the House and the committee with respect to the classified nature of that information and the limitations on the disclosure of that information.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 3, TRANSPORTATION EQUITY ACT: A LEGACY FOR USERS

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3) to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. OBERSTAR

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Oberstar moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H.R. 3) to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes, be instructed to insist on a level of funding for highway, transit, and highway and motor carrier safety programs equal to: (1) the level of funding provided in H.R. 3 (\$283.9 billion); plus (2) the additional resources necessary to increase the guaranteed rate of return for States to not less than 92 percent while ensuring that each State receives no less than it is provided under H.R. 3.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

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

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, when we passed the legislation to extend highway programs for another 30 days, I said that the most hopeful sign for the upcoming conference was the apparent agreement that the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) would chair the conference. That assures that this conference will move expeditiously, on time, with attention to detail and with a deliberate spirit of achieving all that we need to do in policy and financing to get a bill back, a conference report back to the House, to the other body and downtown to be signed.

I know how hard the chairman has worked, how much time and effort and commitment he has made personally to that initiative, and I am proud to work alongside with him.

The motion to instruct that I offer directs House conferees to do two things: Insist in the conference on a level of funding for highway transit

and highway and motor carrier safety programs equal to the level of funding that is in the bill that passed this body, was reported from our committee, passed this body, 283.9, it should be 284, but who is going to quibble with Filene's Basement's version of transportation, and the additional resources necessary to increase the guaranteed rate of return for States to not less than 92 percent, while ensuring that every State gets no less than we provided for every State in our version of the bill.

It has been our goal all along to increase from 90.5 to 92 percent. The question of equity has been central to last year's and the year before and this year's reauthorization debate on surface transportation. In fact, the very title of our bill, Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users, makes equity the very top issue in our legislation.

Donor States, as we have heard for months and months, want their guaranteed rate of return raised from 90.5 percent to as much as 95 percent. Now, we could do 95 percent handily at \$375 billion, the bill that the chairman and I agreed upon, and 74 to 75 members of our committee cosponsored, but that was not possible under the politics of transportation. We understand that.

Donee States, on the other hand, want to ensure that they continue receiving the adequate highway transportation funding that they have been accustomed to and committed to. So the bipartisan bill that we reported from committee in the last Congress set the level at \$375 billion.

We knew that that was not going to be acceptable downtown or very likely in the other body, so we scaled the bill back to \$275 billion. But even then the administration threatened to veto a bill with funding above its view of the proper investment level, which was a paltry \$256 billion that everyone, the contractor community, the labor community, the States, the transit authorities, everybody knows that does not build you one more mile of highway, one new bridge or buy one new transit bus or rail car. Everybody knew that. It was completely unrealistic.

When we got into conference last year just before the August recess, the administration finally put on the table \$283.9 billion. And we said, you know, it is movement in the right direction. Let us take it and let us go with this. But we never reached agreement in conference, which is why, of course, we are back here on the floor.

We agreed at the outset of this Congress to start where we left off in the last Congress, without any smoke and mirrors, without any fussing said, this is the number that is realistic, that if you want to do legislation, this is the way to do it. Let us start with this number.

But we also had to face the reality that it is not possible to do anything above 90.5 percent return on equity for those States who want us to move higher, without taking away from

someone else, without doing damage to core programs, without a whole host of other difficulties.

Now, the other body found some money. The other body found \$11 billion; and in their bill, provided \$295 billion in funding and were able to increase the minimum rate of return to 92 percent. Now, whether that \$11 billion is fiscally sound or politically sustainable is a matter we will have to address when we get into conference, which is why this motion to instruct is important.

We all want to achieve equity. We all want to raise those States up. We all understand, as the other body understood, that if they did not raise their numbers to get to be able to commit \$295 billion, they would not be able to achieve the equity they needed for those western States, large geographic areas and large highway mileages and transportation needs, nor would they be able to satisfy the donor States or other, smaller, donee States. So they needed more money. They realistically approached the issue and approved 11 billion additional dollars.

The reality, as we get into conference, we are not going to be able to, without additional resources, to come up to the \$292 billion level. The other body will need to pass a conference report, and we will not be able to bring back to this body a conference report that will satisfy donor States, donee States without additional resources. So that is why the additional resources language is needed.

□ 1515

All of it comes right on the heels of the Texas Transportation Institute Annual report on congestion, their Urban Mobility Report, issued just a few weeks ago, which finds once again, every year, they find congestion increasing. Overall traffic delays totaled 3.7 billion hours, up from 3.6 billion a year ago.

Congestion and delay cause an additional consumption of 2.3 billion gallons of fuel. That means every driver in America in a congested area is spending 1 week longer in their car than they would if they could drive at posted highway speeds, and they are buying one tank of gasoline more than they would if they could drive at posted highway speeds. It is a moral issue because they are taking the name of the Lord more often in traffic on weekdays than they do in church on Sundays.

We need to address that issue, all three of those issues. We are the most mobile society in history. We travel at an increasing rate and we travel in our cars. Population in the decade of the '90s as expressed in the Census of 2000 group is 4 percent. But transportation usage grew 14 percent, 3-plus times as much as population growths. Total vehicle miles traveled, just vehicle miles traveled, rose 19 percent in that decade. Number of households grew 72 percent in that decade, but household vehicle miles soared 193 percent.

The fact is congestion is choking our cities. It is choking off commerce. It is causing business to spend more money. UPS told me that for every 5 minutes' delay they lose \$40 million nationally, every 5-minute delay. There is a business adverse impact unless we make the investment. It is within our hands to do this.

Now, even at the Senate-passed level of 295, we are \$80 billion below where we know we need to be. What we are saying with this motion to instruct is let us go to conference. Let us keep 92 percent the rate of return on the radar screen, which is our objective and the other body's objective, and get the resources we need and do no less for every State in conference than we did in the House bill.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly oppose this motion to instruct the conferees.

It is a beautifully drafted, I thought, solution to a problem. But I will tell you after reviewing it that if we go to 92 percent and we insist that they be no less than what is in H.R. 3, there will be a problem of having a higher number in de facto. I think we can get there. I just do not think we ought to be instructing the conferees and having the illusion of actually going above to what we vote with 417 votes for in this House.

I will urge the gentleman to consider that as we go to conference that I will do everything in my power to get more money. I think what we ought to be concentrating on is, that yesterday was the seventh extension that we had on this legislation. It is not this body's fault. It is not the House and the people's fault. It is the other side who decided not to finish this product. Yes, we just got the papers today, before we go on this short recess so it has hamstrung us.

I want us to get to conference. I want the conferees to be nominated today. I want us to get the staffs working together to solve this problem. Try to get more money than was there, but sticking with the number of House-passed so that we finally get some stability within the States.

Everything the gentleman said about traffic is absolutely right: it has got worse in the last 4 years. We have seen a tremendous increase of automobile and trade traffic, and we are not addressing that issue as we should be.

I have tried to explain to the people that this is just another step forward. When we do get this bill, it is every intention I have by the first or the middle of June that we will have this bill on the President's desk. But that is just the beginning. We will come back again, and with the gentleman's help,

again and again and again until we solve this problem with transportation in this great Nation of ours.

Yes, we are mobile compared to the rest of the world, but we are very quickly becoming less mobile. We are becoming standing in traffic. We are not able to deliver next day. We are losing effort. We are losing what I call productive hours. And more than that we are losing the edge globally. We are going to have a vote here in the near future on CAFTA, or whatever they call that thing, Central America. We had a vote on NAFTA. We had a vote on GATT. We had a vote on world trade, et cetera, et cetera; and this is well and good, but if we are going to get into that business of trade and production and import and export, we have got to have the transportation system in place. We have to have the rail in place, which it is not.

Every railroad we have today is over-subscribed. We have not laid any new rail access or relieved the congestion on the highway. We have not improved, what I think is necessary, truck lanes, which is in our bill. We have not done the things we should have done and everyone says, well, it will take care of itself. Well, that is a very shortsighted, I think, point of view for this country.

So for those who look upon this bill as the final thing, whatever we come out of a conference, if it is 289, 284, 283, whatever it will be, if it is 290, that is just the beginning. And I hope you take time to understand that.

I again reluctantly oppose the motion to instruct. We will be together in that conference, and we will hopefully together achieve the goals they are seeking.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the chairman, and I simply reiterate what a delight it is to work with him in concert towards the objective we all share.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I thank the ranking member for his leadership on this issue, and I thank the chairman for his leadership.

I know that were we acting independently as a committee to formulate the legislation and set the surface transportation policy for the United States of America, the bill would be much more robust than what is before us today. But we have to deal with the facts that are before us.

We are 20 months overdue on a surface transportation reauthorization. We have extended the old transportation bill seven times at lower levels of funding than under any scenario of bill that will come out of any conference with the House and the Senate.

That means that projects have been foregone, investments have not been made, jobs have not been created.

As the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) point out, people are sitting in traffic. We are not keeping up with demand; we are not keeping up with maintenance as we should.

For every billion dollars we invest, now, remember, we are borrowing a pile of money to run this government, \$1.3 billion a minute to run the government. Some of it goes to pay people, not to grow things. Some of it goes to other programs of dubious value. But for this program, for surface transportation, for highways, for roads, for bridges, for mass transit, we are not borrowing the money. The American people have already paid the tax. It is sitting there waiting to be spent, spent productively, putting people to work, and moving us more efficiently and moving goods more efficiently. We should not forego that.

A billion dollars, 47,000 jobs are created or sustained for every billion-dollar investment; \$6.1 billion in additional economic activity; 32 percent of our major roads are in poor or mediocre condition; 28 percent of bridges are structurally deficient or functionally obsolete; 36 percent of the Nation's urban rail vehicles and maintenance facilities, 29 percent of the Nation's bus fleet and maintenance facilities are in substandard or poor condition.

My State alone, the little State of Oregon, has a \$4.7 billion interstate, not intrastate, interstate bridge problem. The interstate that connects Canada, the United States and Mexico; California, Oregon, and Washington, \$4.7 billion.

Our neighbors to the north in Washington State have one problem, a viaduct problem in Seattle, an incredible safety issue on an incredible choke point and problem. That is \$1.5 billion for that one project. And so it is across the country. Member after Member can come forward and enumerate these projects that are necessary, needed investments.

We need the most robust bill possible. I am hopeful that this is the last extension. I am hopeful this will be a conference that comes to a positive conclusion. We can get this done before the end of June with a sense of urgency and with the leadership of these two gentlemen.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time. I must say that I enjoy serving with the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR). He certainly is one of the most knowledgeable people on transportation issues. He was working on it long before I came to Congress. We agree on many transportation issues. However, I think we may disagree on this particular action he is asking for the House to take.

To paraphrase him, he said we need to address the problem of people taking

the Lord's name more in traffic than they do in church on Sunday. I am right with him. And I am trying to correct that situation.

Again, we agree that we need to move this process forward. This is the seventh extension. There are people waiting. There are jobs waiting. In some areas, unlike Florida, you only have a certain building season. But we have come to an agreement on a 30-day extension. We are about to appoint conferees and move forward with the process that will finish the job. But we do not want to finish the job and start on a shaky foundation. We would send the wrong message now if we put our position forward, the 283.9 or 284 billion, it is the House position.

Agreeing on 92 and sending a message to conference at this point, I submit, is premature. Why would you show your cards at this particular juncture in the conference process? We may be able to do better. We may not have the money to do the 92. We may be putting ourselves in a very difficult position to start out the conference in already dealing with an administration that we know is temperamental on this issue. So we need to move forward on a good solid foundation.

We do not need to pass this.

The other thing, too, I heard our majority leader address some folks from Florida, and he said in Congress the legislative process is something that is very important. He said they have a term for this in Texas. He said they called it "strategey," just joking of course, for strategy. And I submit this is strategery, not good strategy, because we are not moving forward in a timely fashion.

Members have not been alerted to this action. Some Members, I think, have already departed the Chamber and are on their way to Memorial Day events back in their districts. So from a strategic standpoint, I think we make a mistake by even offering this at this time. I think at the right time with the right strategy that we could do better to move this process and also the dollars forward to build our Nation's infrastructure.

□ 1530

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I appreciate the difficulty in which my committee colleagues find themselves in this matter, but I would also observe that the business of the House is never over until the adjournment vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in yielding me this time to speak on his motion to instruct.

And I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I join in the gentleman's assessment of the capacity of the chairman of our committee, who will be chairing the conference committee; and we know

there will be no cell phones that will violate the sanctity of the conference committee activity. Would that it would set the tone for the entire Congress.

I take modest exception to my friend from Florida, because I think the spirit with which this is offered is to, in fact, strengthen the foundation upon which the chairman and the members of our conference committee will go into this discussion. It is an opportunity for us to present a united front in the House.

I think it is quite clear, based on the work that has gone on in the course of the last 2½ years, that there is strong, strong interest and understanding and appreciation of what robust means. This is an opportunity for us to demonstrate once again the breadth of support that our chairman and our leadership take into this conference committee.

It is truly the broadest base of support for a transportation infrastructure bill that we have ever seen. It represents from coast to coast, rural and urban, small State, suburb, not just highway, of which we are deeply concerned, but our chairman and ranking member are deeply appreciative of the relationship of all the transportation modes and many of the smaller projects that are within the ambit of the ISTEA legislation.

This vote on the motion to instruct will clearly strengthen the hand of the Chair and of the House. It is a point of departure. I am willing to follow them forward if we can expand the boundaries here to capture the spirit and the interest and the concern not just of our committee, but the people that we represent at home and the Members in the House.

With all due respect, I would suggest that the offer with which I think this is offered and that I will support is to strengthen the hand of the chairman and ranking member, strengthen the hand of the House, and capture the broad base of support so we can be successful in this important deliberation.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me this time, and I echo the remarks of my colleague from Oregon as well the ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. This is a bipartisan bill. I cannot do anything more than to congratulate Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member OBERSTAR for the collaborative method in which they have approached the legislation that would provide for transportation for America.

But, Mr. Speaker, this motion to instruct is a big plus for the State of Texas because of the great changing needs that we are facing: The congestion that we are facing not only in our cities, but in our rural areas, the necessity of urban areas to have sound walls

in order to ensure that transportation is near neighborhoods, the increasing use of toll roads, primarily because there is need for more money to provide for transportation, the lack of dollars to help with our rail systems throughout America.

Clearly, we need to ensure that the funding in H.R. 3, that was collaboratively voted on in a bipartisan manner, is preserved and to instruct that our States receive the dollars necessary for safety and for transportation. This motion to instruct is simply a gift to the conferees in order to give them the enhanced instruction to make the transportation bill the one that provides jobs, builds highways, provides highway safety programs and transit programs; and for me, happening to be a mass transit supporter, we would hope these dollars would also be focused on bus transportation and mass transportation, including light rail, which is so needed in the city of Houston.

So I hope my colleagues will support enthusiastically this motion to instruct because, again, it provides a solid foundation for us to build a new and innovative transportation system for all of America.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to thank the gentlewoman from Houston for her thoughtful remarks, representing the Nation's fourth largest urban area. She certainly knows whereof she speaks about transportation and congestion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN), the ranking member on our Subcommittee on Railroads.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I want to thank Chairman YOUNG and Chairman PETRI, and particularly I want to thank Ranking Member OBERSTAR for his leadership on this issue.

This bill is over 2 years overdue, and that is just not fair to the Nation's traveling public who deserve better from this Congress and, of course, from this administration. We spend \$1 billion a week in Iraq, yet there is a question as to the level of spending in this transportation bill. Clearly, the committee voted \$318 billion for transportation. The Department of Transportation itself said that we needed \$375 billion. They said \$375 billion.

The Department of Transportation statistics show that for every \$1 billion invested in transportation infrastructure, it creates 42,000 jobs. It also saves the lives of 1,400 people, and you cannot argue with those figures. Transportation funding is a win-win for everyone involved. The States get to improve their transportation and infrastructure. That creates economic development and puts people back to work; it enhances safety and improves local communities.

By delaying the passage of this much-needed legislation, we are doing a disservice to the driving public and

to the Nation as a whole. The States are battling red ink and want to see this bill passed. The construction companies, who are laying off employees, want to see this bill passed. And the citizens waiting in traffic jams in Orlando, Florida, and central Florida want to see this bill pass.

Let us get serious about putting people back to work and let us pass a bill that truly meets the needs of the traveling public and not the needs of this President who is trying to look fiscally responsible while he runs up the national debt.

I encourage everyone to contact their Members and ask them to support transportation funding that truly meets the needs of this growing Nation. We need to stop spending money everywhere but here in the United States. Transportation infrastructure spending is an investment in America, and it is time we spent money on something that benefits the people that are actually paying the bills.

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

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

We have had a good discussion of the subject matter. I think it need not be further elaborated. Again, if you are serious about a good result in the conference, you will support this motion to instruct conferees, a fair, equitable, and balanced motion.

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. 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 189, nays 223, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 227]

YEAS—189

Abercrombie	Brown, Corrine	Davis (CA)
Ackerman	Butterfield	Davis (FL)
Allen	Capps	Davis (IL)
Andrews	Capuano	Davis (TN)
Baca	Cardin	Davis, Tom
Baird	Cardoza	DeFazio
Baldwin	Carnahan	DeGette
Barrow	Carson	DeLauro
Bean	Case	Dicks
Becerra	Chandler	Dingell
Berman	Clay	Doggett
Berry	Cleaver	Edwards
Bishop (GA)	Clyburn	Emanuel
Bishop (NY)	Conyers	Engel
Blumenauer	Cooper	Eshoo
Boren	Costa	Etheridge
Boswell	Costello	Evans
Boucher	Crowley	Farr
Boyd	Cuellar	Ford
Brady (PA)	Cummings	Frank (MA)
Brown (OH)	Davis (AL)	Gonzalez

Gordon Matsui Sabo Platts Ryun (KS) Taylor (NC)
 Green, Al McCollum (MN) Poe Saxton Terry
 Grijalva McGovern Sánchez, Linda Pombo Saxon Thomas
 Gutierrez McIntyre T. Sanchez, Loretta Portner Sensenbrenner Thornberry
 Harman McKinney Scott (GA) Sessions Shirkus Tiaht
 Hastings (FL) Meehan Sanders Pryce (OH) Shadegg Tiberi
 Herseeth Meek (FL) Schakowsky Putnam Shaw Turner
 Higgins Meeks (NY) Schiff Radanovich Shays Upton
 Hincney Melancon Schwartz (PA) Ramstad Sherwood Walden (OR)
 Hinojosa Michaud Scott (GA) Shimkus Walsh
 Holt Miller (NC) Scott (VA) Rehberg Shuster Wamp
 Honda Miller, George Serrano Reichert Serrano Weldon (FL)
 Hooley Mollohan Sherman Renzi Weller
 Hoyer Moore (KS) Skelton Reynolds Smith (NJ) Westmoreland
 Inslee Moore (WI) Slaughter Rogers (AL) Smith (TX) Whitfield
 Israel Moran (VA) Snyder Rogers (KY) Sodrel Wicker
 Jackson (IL) Murtha Solis Rogers (MI) Souder Wilson (NM)
 Jackson-Lee Nadler Spratt Rohrabacher Stearns Wilson (SC)
 (TX) Napolitano Stark Ros-Lehtinen Sullivan Wolf
 Jefferson Neal (MA) Strickland Royce Sweeney Young (AK)
 Johnson, E. B. Oberstar Stupak Ryan (WI) Tancredo Young (FL)

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FATAH. Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently voted against the Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 3, which instructs conferees to increase funding for the Transportation/Highway bill. The motion would increase the minimum guaranteed rate of return to 92 percent, while ensuring that each state receives no less than what is provided under the bill.

I request that the record reflect that I support the motion and I intended to vote for it.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 167) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 167

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, May 26, 2005, or Friday, May 27, 2005, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, June 7, 2005, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on Thursday, May 26, 2005, or Friday, May 27, 2005, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, June 6, 2005, or Tuesday, June 7, 2005, or until such other time on either of those days as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

Sec. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 30, 2005

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday, May 30, 2005, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in House Concurrent Resolution 167, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

NOT VOTING—21

Green, Gene Menendez
 Hastings (WA) Millender-
 Holden McDonald
 Jenkins Smith (WA)
 Kind Taylor (MS)
 Doyle McCarthy Weldon (PA)
 McDermott
 McNulty

□ 1602

Mr. BONNER, Mr. OTTER, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. ISTOOK and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The Chair will appoint conferees at a later time.

Stated for:
 Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 227, on H.R. 3 Motion to Instruct, I was in my Congressional District on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on May 26, 2005, I unfortunately missed 5 recorded votes and regret missing them.

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 223, On Ordering the Previous Question (House Resolution 298), had I been present, I would have voted “no.” I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 224, On Agreeing to the Melancon of Louisiana Amendment (House Resolution 2528), had I been present, I would have voted “aye.” I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 225, On Agreeing to the Blumenauer of Oregon Amendment (House Resolution 2528), had I been present, I would have voted “aye.” I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 226, Final Passage of H.R. 2528, the Military Quality of Life & Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.” I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 227, On Motion to Instruct Conferees to the Transportation Equity Act, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.” I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the RECORD.

ADDERHOLT Dreier Kelly
 Akin Duncan Kennedy (MN)
 Alexander Ehlers King (IA)
 Bachus English (PA) King (NY)
 Baker Everett Kingston
 Barrett (SC) Fattah Kirk
 Bartlett (MD) Feeney Kline
 Barton (TX) Ferguson Knollenberg
 Bass Fitzpatrick (PA) Kolbe
 Beauprez Flake Kuhl (NY)
 Biggert Foley LaHood
 Bilirakis Forbes Latham
 Bishop (UT) Fortenberry LaTourette
 Blackburn Fossella Leach
 Blunt Foxx Lewis (CA)
 Boehlert Franks (AZ) Lewis (KY)
 Boehner Frelinghuysen Linder
 Bonilla Gallegly LoBiondo
 Bonner Garrett (NJ) Lucas
 Bono Gerlach Lungren, Daniel
 Boozman Gibbons E.
 Boustany Gilchrest Mack
 Bradley (NH) Gillmor Manzullo
 Brady (TX) Gingrey Marchant
 Brown (SC) Gohmert McCaul (TX)
 Brown-Waite, Goode McCotter
 Ginny Goodlatte McCrery
 Burgess Granger McHenry
 Burton (IN) Graves McHugh
 Buyer Green (WI) McKeon
 Calvert Gutknecht McMorris
 Camp Hall Mica
 Cannon Harris Miller (FL)
 Cantor Hart Miller (MI)
 Capito Hayes Miller, Gary
 Carter Hayworth Moran (KS)
 Castle Hefley Murphy
 Chabot Hensarling Musgrave
 Chocola Herger Myrick
 Coble Hobson Neugebauer
 Cole (OK) Hoekstra Ney
 Conaway Hostettler Northup
 Cox Hulshof Norwood
 Crenshaw Hunter Nunes
 Cubin Hyde Nussle
 Culberson Inglis (SC) Osborne
 Davis (KY) Issa Otter
 Davis, Jo Ann Istook Oxley
 DeLay Jindal Pearce
 Dent Johnson (CT) Pence
 Diaz-Balart, L. Johnson (IL) Peterson (PA)
 Diaz-Balart, M. Johnson, Sam Petri
 Doolittle Jones (NC) Pickering
 Drake Keller Pitts

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 8, 2005

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, June 8, 2005.

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

There was no objection.

MEMORIAL DAY

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take this opportunity to thank America's veterans and to offer my sympathy to those families that will experience for the first time and for many, many times the difficulty of Memorial Day, for they are the families that are now suffering the loss of a loved one who has fallen in battle or in the service of his or her country.

Today, we had the honor of traveling to Arlington Cemetery, as I said earlier, to place the wreath of honor in honor of women who have fallen in battle. The good news about America is that in times of conflict, however we may disagree on the policy, we are united behind the men and women who leave their homes and leave their families and leave all that they love to be able to serve this country.

My sadness, however, is that there are so many that are coming back in caskets covered and draped by the American flag. And so I think it is extremely important that on this Memorial Day, we are united in our honoring and our admiration and our affection for those who have lost their lives in Iraq and Afghanistan.

May God bless them, God bless their families, and God bless the United States of America.

COMMUNICATION FROM INSPECTOR GENERAL, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHL of New York) laid before the House the following communication from Steven A. McNamara, Inspector General, House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2005.

MEMORANDUM

To: Hon. DENNIS HASTERT, Speaker of the House.
Hon. TOM DELAY, Majority Leader of the House.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI, Minority Leader of the House.
From: STEVEN A. MCNAMARA, Inspector General.
Subject: Notification of Resignation and Retirement.

Please accept my offer of resignation, as the Inspector General for the U.S. House of

Representatives, effective May 30, 2005. This date will also be my effective date of retirement from Federal Service.

It has been an honor to serve the House as the Inspector General for the last five years. My goal, and that of my staff, has been to help the House achieve the best use of all the dollars it spends, increase efficiencies, and ensure the health, safety, and security of Members, staff, and visitors. Through the combined support of the House Leadership, the Committee on House Administration, and the hard work of my staff, I believe we have helped the House accomplish its administrative goals.

Now, after slightly more than 35 years of Federal Service, I look forward to a new chapter in my life; the pursuit of a hobby and business venture as a kayak instructor and kayaking guide.

Once again, it has been a great honor to serve the House of the Inspector General for the last five years. It has been a fulfilling and rewarding experience!

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

INTRODUCTION OF REDUCING
CRIME AND TERRORISM AT
AMERICA'S SEAPORTS ACT OF
2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, along with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE), chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, I am pleased to introduce the Reducing Crime and Terrorism at America's Seaports Act of 2005.

There are 361 seaports in the United States that serve essential national interests by facilitating the flow of trade and the movement of cruise passengers, as well as supporting the effective and safe deployment of U.S. Armed Forces. These seaport facilities and other marine areas cover some 3.5 million square miles of ocean area and 95,000 miles of coastline.

Millions of shipping containers pass through our ports every month. A single container has room for as much as 60,000 pounds of explosives, 10 to 15 times the amount in the Ryder truck used to blow up the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City. When you consider that a single ship can carry as many as 8,000 containers at one time, the vulnerability of our seaports is alarming.

Each year, more than 141 million ferry and cruise ship passengers, more than 2 billion tons of domestic and international freight and 3 billion tons of oil move through U.S. seaports. Millions of truck-size cargo containers are off-loaded onto U.S. docks. Many seaports are still protected by little more than a chain link fence and, in far too

many instances, have no adequate safeguards to ensure that only authorized personnel can access sensitive areas of the port. If we allow this system to continue unchecked, it is only a matter of time until terrorists attempt to deliver a weapon of mass destruction to our doorstep via ship, truck or cargo container.

New reports by the Government Accountability Office, Congress' investigative arm, fault both the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism and the Container Security Initiative. C-TPAT allows international shippers to get quicker clearance through Customs in exchange for voluntary security measures. But the GAO said that the U.S. Customs and Border Protection's vetting process was not thorough enough. It found that only 10 percent of the certified members had been validated through an actual physical inspection by the Agency. The rest had been certified by paperwork applications.

As part of the recently passed Homeland Security authorization bill, the House took some important steps to improve the screening of cargo by expanding the Container Security Initiative and refocusing it, based on risk. But the truth is that not every container can be inspected, and we need to use other tools at our disposal to deter those who would use our seaports as a point of attack until we can inspect or somehow verify each container. Strengthening criminal penalties, as Chairman COBLE and I are proposing with this bill, is one way we make our Nation's ports less vulnerable.

The Reducing Crime and Terrorism at America's Seaports Act of 2005 will fill a gaping hole in our defense against terrorism and make American ports, passengers and cargo safer. Our bill is substantially similar to bipartisan Senate legislation introduced earlier this year by Senators BIDEN and SPECTER and supported by other key members of the Judiciary Committee, including Senators DIANNE FEINSTEIN and ORRIN HATCH. The Senate version of this legislation has been reported favorably by the Senate Judiciary Committee and is awaiting action by the full Senate.

Our bill makes common-sense changes to our criminal laws and will help to close security gaps confronting our ports. The amendment will make it a crime to use a vessel to smuggle terrorists or dangerous materials, including nuclear material, into the U.S., impose stiff criminal penalties for providing false information to a Federal law enforcement officer at a port or on a vessel, and double the sentence of anyone who fraudulently gains access to a seaport.

Our bill would also directly address several immediate threats by increasing penalties for smugglers who misrepresent illicit cargo. It would also bridge specific gaps in current Federal law by making it a crime for a vessel operator to fail to stop when ordered to

do so by a Federal law enforcement officer.

Mr. Speaker, America's ports remain vulnerable and this Nation needs a multifaceted strategy to secure them and to deter those who would harm this country. The Reducing Crime and Terrorism at America's Seaports Act of 2005 is part of that strategy.

I urge my colleagues to join Chairman COBLE and me by cosponsoring this legislation.

□ 1615

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLE of New York). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GUTKNECHT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

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

There was no objection.

BORDER CONTROL AND AMNESTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, this month a bill to grant amnesty to illegal immigrants was introduced in the United States Senate.

I think we should send a very clear message to the other body not to waste their time or ours on any bill dealing with the status of illegal immigrants until we first secure our borders.

What good does it do to try to address the problems of 11 to 16 million people who are here illegally if we do not address the gaping wound that allowed them in this country to start with?

The majority of illegals simply walk across our woefully undermanned 2,000-mile border with Mexico. We could deport them back to their country of origin, and millions would be pouring back across that same border within hours. We could turn our backs on justice and the rule of law and declare everyone here as now to be legal. Within hours we would have millions more illegal immigrants walking across that same border, encouraged by the fact that they could laugh at our laws with impunity.

Either extreme, or anything in between, is pointless while we let our border continue to bleed. Trying to defend 1,951 miles of border against 4 million illegal immigrants a year with just 10,817 border patrol officers is a mathematical impossibility.

This month Customs and Border Protection Commissioner Robert Bonner

told the House Committee on Government Reform that we could secure the border, that we could secure the border, with an additional 50,000 auxiliary officers. That figure is in very close agreement with the draft field research by the Immigration Reform Caucus that was reported this week by the Washington Times, CNN's Lou Dobbs, and Fox News, which estimates 36,000 auxiliaries may accomplish the same purpose.

Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger of California and Janet Napolitano of Arizona, Bill Richardson of New Mexico, and Governor Rick Perry of Texas can order their National Guard, with support from other States through the National Guard Bureau, to secure their section of their border today. We have already authorized the Secretary of Defense to pay the cost of that deployment in last year's Defense Authorization Act. In addition, we are bringing home 70,000 Federal troops from around the world, where they have been guarding other nations' borders for the past 60 years. A simple executive order from the President would allow them to relieve our National Guard and have 20,000 men and women to spare.

All it takes, Mr. Speaker, is will. We have the manpower and we have the money.

Mr. Speaker, on May 5 the American people responded to a Zogby nationwide poll on this issue. They approve using Federal troops to secure our border by a 53 to 40 percent margin. They approve using State and local law agencies to help secure our border by an 81 to 14 percent margin. They oppose an amnesty plan like that proposed in the Senate by a 56 to 35 percent margin.

This week, after the border patrol draft reported by caucus investigators was released, CNN online polls were running 92 percent in favor of using our military to control our borders. In response, the Mexican Government this week spoke out against us securing our border with our troops.

The American public demands we do so.

Now is the time for every Member of this body to choose whose side we are on.

SMART SECURITY AND THE NEED FOR AN IRAQ PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to take a good, hard look at the role the United States is playing in Iraq and whether or not it is in our national interest to maintain a military presence.

We need to acknowledge the fact that Iraq's insurgency is growing in strength, not diminishing, and that the very presence of 150,000 American troops on Iraqi soil appears as though they see us as occupiers that actually

unites the growing collection of insurgent forces.

Since our military presence actually encourages further fighting, this war will continue as long as U.S. troops remain in Iraq. That is why Congress must accept the fact that we cannot possibly bring our involvement in Iraq to any kind of successful conclusion through military means.

Yesterday, during consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006, I offered an amendment urging the President to develop a plan for the withdrawal of troops from Iraq. Surprisingly, this was the first time the House has formally debated the possibility of withdrawal from Iraq. We were allotted only 30 minutes for the debate: 15 minutes on my side, 15 minutes on the side opposing my amendment. But it is no surprise, of course, the amendment was defeated. But in spite of that, it is clear that the Congress is starting to get serious about a plan for leaving Iraq. 128 Members, including five Republicans, voted for this amendment.

But there is much more work to do, Mr. Speaker. The Iraq war has now raged on for more than 2 years, and we are no closer to winning this conflict than we were when President Bush declared an end to major combat operations under an arrogant banner declaring "Mission Accomplished."

Despite this lack of progress, the war has exacted a deeply troubling human and financial toll. In just over 2 years of war, more than 1,600 American soldiers and an estimated 25,000 Iraqi innocents have been killed. The Pentagon lists the number of Americans wounded as just over 12,000. But that does not take into account even the invisible wounds many of our soldiers will be bringing home and have already brought home, the painful mental trauma they have contracted from months and years of fighting. When accounting for these psychological injuries, the number of wounded jumps to nearly 40,000.

To date, Congress has appropriated more than \$200 billion for military operations in Iraq, despite little to no oversight as to how these funds are going to be spent, which has allowed \$9 billion in reconstruction funds to just vanish from the coffers of the Coalition Provisional Authority, which was the American governing body that managed Iraq until the year 2004.

Given what is at stake here, do the American people not deserve a plan? Do our brave men and women, who are selflessly sacrificing their lives, not to mention their arms, legs, for a war that we should not be in in the first place, not deserve a plan?

Let us not forget that the legislative branch is constitutionally mandated to oversee expenditures from our National Treasury. Instead of allowing fat-cat war profiteers like Halliburton and its subsidiary, Kellogg, Brown and Root, to line their pockets as war profiteers, it is time Congress started fulfilling our responsibility.

We must develop a smarter agenda. We must develop an agenda that will help Iraq, and we will then be able to reduce our military occupation. We must insist on planning by the Bush administration. This 2-year war has left us disturbingly weak against the true security threats we face. Let us not forget that Osama bin Laden is still at large and al Qaeda continues to recruit new members in Iraq as well as the rest of the Middle East.

Fortunately, there is a plan that would secure America for the future: the SMART Security concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 158, which I recently reintroduced with the support of 49 of my House colleagues. SMART is a Sensible, Multilateral, American Response to Terrorism for the 21st Century. It will help us address the threats we face as a Nation. SMART Security will prevent terrorism by addressing the very conditions which allow terrorism to take root: poverty, despair, resource scarcity, and lack of educational opportunity. Instead of rushing off to war under false pretenses, SMART Security encourages the United States to work with other nations to address the most pressing global issues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

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

There was no objection.

AMERICAN POLICY IN THE BALKANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, allow me to address a very deep and growing concern about American policy in the Balkans. The policy of the United States should be predicated upon its own interests and its own sovereignty and security. Defying reason, somehow we keep hearing that the current administration plans to continue the former administration's policy in Southeast Europe.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand this, given the fact that we have learned so much about the nature of the foreign fighters that have come into Bosnia-Herzegovina to fight the Serbs, and now we have encountered them ourselves in Iraq.

To observe the current unemployment and socialist economic structure in Kosovo is to recognize that the previous administration's so-called policy there has been an absolute and utter failure. I certainly agree that we should be looking for a workable solution for all in that region; but in order to do so, we cannot disregard the fact that there have been over 300 mosques constructed in Kosovo since 1999, mostly funded by Saudi Arabia, while at the very same time, 150 Serbian churches, Orthodox churches, about 10 percent of all the churches in Kosovo, have been destroyed. And I am wondering if this is the legacy that we want to leave for the United States involvement, Mr. Speaker.

Further, we can now clearly see that many of the most dangerous terrorists that the United States has encountered in the fight against terrorism have had some connection to the Balkans and particularly Bosnia. For example, two of the September 11 hijackers fought in the wars in Bosnia. Sohel al Saahli fought in Afghanistan, Bosnia, and Chechnya; and he later became a leader in Iraq and was killed in a U.S. air strike in March of 2003. Abdel Aziz al Muqrin, al Qaeda's leader in Saudi Arabia, personally decapitated Paul Johnson; and he had fought in Bosnia, Algeria, Ethiopia, and Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, there is an alarming pattern here.

Abu Anas al Shami fought with other Jordanian extremists to fight jihad in Bosnia. He was the right hand of Abu Masab al Zarqawi fighting against U.S. forces in Iraq until he was killed in September, 2004.

And, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, our Balkans policies helped these terrorists.

And now there is data found on Mr. Zarqawi's laptop computer indicating that terrorists have the means and the plans to use WMDs here in Europe and perhaps even here someday, in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, given these disturbing details, the fact that we are now moving troops out of Bosnia and out of the Balkans is a profound concern to me. Further, as a guarantor of the Dayton Peace Accords, we have a duty to reaffirm them and to ensure a sense of comity and fair play. We should not seek to change them through a coercive top-down pressure, as has been recently attempted in the talks in Bosnia under the auspices of the High Representative, Paddy Ashdown, and this with the approval of our U.S. Ambassador Douglas McElhanev.

I am also very concerned that, according to news reports, our ambassador incited public opinion against the Republic of Srpska's chief of police by insinuating that he should be removed from office for statements he made concerning the nexus between Bosnia and the Madrid bombings.

□ 1630

Mr. Speaker, the police chief's statements concerning the relationship be-

tween certain individuals and materials in Bosnia and the horrific Madrid bombings that took place last year deserve our attention and our investigation rather than our rebuke. I truly believe, Mr. Speaker, it is time we take a second, very serious look at the realities and the growing terrorist danger in Bosnia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMAN of New York). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EMANUEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IN OPPOSITION TO CANCELLATION OF GENOCIDE CONFERENCE IN TURKEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to voice my outrage and great disappointment about a recent development in Turkey. A conference set to begin yesterday in Bogazici University, of Turkish scholars and academics, entitled "Ottoman Armenians During the Decline of the Empire: Issues of Scientific Responsibility and Democracy," was indefinitely postponed by the university organizers.

According to Agence France-Presse, Turkish Justice Minister Cemil Cicek yesterday accused conference organizers of committing treason, saying, "We must put an end to this cycle of treason and insults, of spreading propaganda against the Turkish nation by people who belong to it." In addition, Turkish officials have demanded copies of all papers submitted to the conference.

The development further affirms the speculation that the image that the Turkish Government has attempted to create for itself is nothing more than a desperate attempt to create a facade. Contrary to what Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan and other Turkish officials would have us believe, the Government of Turkey is not democratic, is not committed to creating a democracy, is not making an effort to create better relations with Armenia and is definitely not ready to join the European Union.

Over the last year, we have witnessed the Government of Turkey attempt to move towards democratization. However, the manner in which they have chosen to do so is an insult to any truly democratic government. Their attempts have included the adoption of a penal code that, in reality, represents a dramatic display of the Turkish government's campaign to deny the Armenian genocide. Furthermore, this new criminal code further hindered improved relations between the Republic of Armenia and Turkey.

Section 306 of this penal code punishes individual Turkish citizens or groups that confirm the fact of the Armenian genocide in Ottoman Turkey or call for the end of the Turkish occupation of Northern Cyprus, with up to 10 years in prison. Far from coming to terms with the genocide or reaching out to Armenia, Turkey, in adopting Section 306 of its new penal code, hardened its anti-Armenian stance and undermined hopes for reduction of tension in the region. This sets the stage for possible legal action against conference planners and participants. The Turkish Government has refused to support rescinding this prohibition against free speech, despite international criticism.

Mr. Speaker, with the cancellation of this conference, we find that the Government of Turkey will go to any length to avoid facing its bloody past. In just 2 weeks, Turkey's prime minister will be in the United States for an official visit, proclaiming that his nation is a democracy ready for full membership in the European Community and asking for U.S. support. The sad reality, Mr. Speaker, is that when it comes to facing the judgment of history about the Armenian genocide, Turkey, rather than acknowledging the truth, has instead chosen to trample on the rights of its citizens and still maintain lies.

Hrant Dink, editor of the Armenian weekly *Agos* in Turkey stated, "This decision strengthens the hand of those outside Turkey who say Turkey has not changed, it is not democratic enough to discuss the Armenian issue, it shows there is a difference between what the government says and its intentions."

Numerous European countries, including Poland, France and Greece, have passed Armenian genocide resolutions and have continuously urged Turkey to admit its crime. Just this week, French President Jacques Chirac urged Turkey to recognize the genocide and said failure to do so could harm Ankara's drive to join the European Union.

We cannot sit by and allow any nation that we consider an ally and a nation that is desperately seeking admission into the European Union to behave in such a manner. To bring this development into perspective, consider that according to current law in Turkey, dozens of U.S. Senators and hundreds of Congressmen would be punished simply for having voted for Armenian genocide resolutions, spoken about the lessons of this crime against humanity or commemorated the victims of the atrocity. So, too, would the American academic establishment, human rights groups, the mainstream media and just about everyone else aside from the Turkish embassy and its paid lobbyists here in Washington, D.C.

Only by being prepared to admit mistakes and make amends can the Turkish Government truly be considered a nation governed by the values of democracy. This recent event reveals the

vulnerable side of Turkey, one that is still hiding from its history and is incapable of learning from its mistakes so as to ensure that they will not be repeated in the future.

Mr. Speaker, the United States prides itself on being the world's leader in spreading democracy and liberty. As an effective leader, it is our duty to recognize that Turkey is not yet a democratic state and it will take a sincere effort on the part of Turkey to make a transition from a government that currently advocates censorship and lack of freedom of speech to one that embraces the principles of democracy in its true meaning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MEMORIAL DAY—PAYING A DEBT TO THOSE WE CAN NEVER REPAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, with Memorial Day 2005 just around the corner, men and women in Congress are hurrying home for festivities like those that we will enjoy in Indiana. This Sunday, the Indianapolis 500 Mile Race will draw half a million people. But it will not be the most important occasion of this long family weekend, because Hoosiers will gather in places like New Castle and Muncie and Elwood, Indiana, to commemorate this Memorial Day.

I could not help but think about the obligations of this day as I toured the battlefield of Antietam, near Sharpsburg, Maryland, just last weekend. There, Mr. Speaker, I walked on the ground that saw 6,000 Americans fall in battle in a single day, the bloodiest day in American history. Six thousand Americans at Antietam would turn into 600,000 Americans on both sides of the battle that fell in the Civil War.

Just 3 years after the end of that conflict, Americans set aside the 30th day of May each year to remember their sacrifice, and for 130 years, Decoration Day became Memorial Day, and it is something that we take seriously in the Hoosier State, as it will be taken seriously in every State in this Union.

The Bible says, If you owe debts, pay debts; if honor, then honor; if respect, then respect. I rise humbly as the Congressman from the Sixth District of Indiana to pay a debt of respect and honor to those men who have fallen most recently in the service of this Nation in my congressional district.

These are men like Sergeant Jeremy Wright, who died January 3, 2005, when an improvised explosive device struck

his military vehicle. He was 31 and a part of the Special Forces group from Fort Lewis.

Master Sergeant Mike Hiester died March 26, 2005, when his military vehicle also struck a land mine 30 miles west of Kabul, Afghanistan. He was 33, from Bluffton, Indiana, survived by his brave wife, Dawn, and two small children. He was with the 76th Infantry Brigade, Army National Guard, Indianapolis. Both men fell in Operation Enduring Freedom.

In Operation Iraqi Freedom we remember Lance Corporal Matthew Smith, who died May 10, 2003, in a vehicle accident in Kuwait, age 20, from Anderson, Indiana. He was a Reservist assigned to Detachment 1, Communications Company, 4th Force Service Support Group, Peru, Indiana.

Private Shawn Pahnke was killed June 16, 2003, by a sniper while on patrol. He was 25, of Shelbyville, Indiana. He was with the 1st Battalion, 37th Armored Regiment, 1st Armored Division, Friedberg, Germany.

Specialist Chad Keith who was killed July 7, 2003, in Iraq, when a roadside bomb exploded as his unit patrolled the streets of Baghdad. He was 21, from Batesville, Indiana. He was with Company D, Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

Staff Sergeant Frederick Miller, Jr. Fred was killed September 20, 2003, when an IED hit his vehicle. He was 27, from Hagerstown, Indiana, and was with the 3rd Armored Cavalry Regiment, Fort Carson, Colorado.

Sergeant Robert Colvill, Jr., was among five soldiers killed 8 July 2004 in Baghdad. All were in the Iraqi National Guard headquarters when it came under mortar attack. He was 31 and from Anderson, Indiana, part of the 1st Infantry Division in Schweinfurt, Germany.

And Specialist Raymond White. Ray died 12 November 2004, in Baghdad, when his patrol was attacked with small arms fire. Ray was 22 and from Elwood, Indiana.

It is an honor to serve such men, Mr. Speaker, and it is an honor to rise and to pay some debt of honor and recognition to these brave men and their families.

As we approach this Memorial Day, we do it with humility and no small amount of emotion, knowing that as we read these names, they are more than names. They are sons, they are husbands, they are brothers, they are uncles, they are friends and they are neighbors; and they are gone. Gone perhaps to this world, but I am confident not to the next. Their duty was to serve. Our duty is to remember.

So I rise with a deep spirit of humility simply before this Memorial Day arrives to remember these men; to assure them and all of the tens of thousands who went before them that this Nation will never fail to feel the gratitude for their sacrifice, and on this Memorial Day never fail to pray for them, for the salvation of their immortal souls, and for the comfort of those they left behind.

Happy Memorial Day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DEMOCRATS NOT REVEALING THEIR HAND ON SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was stunned today when I picked up a copy of *The Hill* magazine and saw an article written by Hans Nichols, and the headline was "Rubin Urges Democrats Not to Reveal Their Hand, Clinton Aide Tells Party to Hold Firm on Social Security."

They go on to describe, "The steward of President Clinton's economic policy told the House Democratic Caucus yesterday that it needs to continue to hold firm in opposition to the President's plan and advised Democrats not to introduce their own plan, according to aides and lawmakers in the meeting."

It goes on to say, "The aide said that Rubin told his party that his party's colleagues would be hard-pressed to win a battle of specifics."

Hard-pressed to win a battle of specifics, this from the former Treasury Secretary, a man largely credited with building the international reputation of Goldman Sachs, which is all about specifics, tells the party, the Democrats, not to offer specifics.

And they say, "Democratic lawmakers said that the encouragement from a Clinton administration figure would steel the Caucus in its resolve to defeat the President's plan." Steel the caucus to defeat a plan. Of course, they do not have one of their own.

Since they are using President Clinton as an example, his experts say, "Do not offer a plan," let me read to you Morton Kondracke's editorial, "Democrats Need Their Own Social Security Plan."

"It is time for Democrats to declare what kind of Social Security reform they favor. Even former President Clinton thinks so. Yet the Democrats persist in attacking President Bush's ideas, often misleadingly.

President Clinton told ABC's "Good Morning, America" in an exchange curiously not broadcast, curiously not broadcast, "I think Democrats should

say what they are for on Social Security in the next couple weeks. Democrats should have a plan and they should talk to the President and congressional Republicans about it."

"According to ABC's political blog, The Note, Clinton said he didn't think Democrats deserved criticism for not producing a plan yet, but they still had time to produce one. He added, 'I think they need to come up with a plan of their own.'

"One Member," the gentleman from Florida, ROBERT WEXLER, whom I respect and admire, "came up with a plan and he was largely booed by his colleagues." Largely booed. "According to numerous aides, minority leader PELOSI's strategy is to wait until we see the whites of their eyes before offering a Democratic alternative. Democratic leadership aides were critical of Wexler's timing, saying it clashed with PELOSI's strategy of waiting until they see the whites of their eyes before offering a Democratic alternative."

□ 1645

Wait until they see the whites of their eyes. Like this is a battle, like this is a combat mission. It is, after all, about saving Social Security for future generations, not about fighting an enemy force. Seeing the whites of their eyes has largely been equated to battle, to taking down the enemy. They are using those same kinds of conversations about American citizens trying to build a safety net in Social Security.

Lo and behold: "Teamsters President Praises Bush's Social Security Work. Teamsters President James P. Hoffa, breaking his estrangement from the White House, praised President Bush on Tuesday for attempting to fix Social Security and said Democrats were wrong to oppose any discussion until Mr. Bush drops his personal retirement account plan." That is Jimmy Hoffa representing 1.4 million members of a union. And he said he was willing to work with the administration and the Republican majority in Congress to come up with a bipartisan solution.

I quote Mr. Hoffa: "Social Security is a major problem in this country. We have to make sure that it is preserved for those that come after us," Mr. Hoffa said in an interview with Gannett News Service. "I think President Bush should be given credit for the fact that he has initiated a debate regarding what we should do."

Now let me read some quotes from Democrats who, when President Clinton had a plan, oh, they were enthusiastic. This refers to President Clinton: "This fiscal crisis in Social Security affects every generation."

Let us read HARRY REID, the minority leader of the Senate: "Most of us have no problem with taking a small amount of the Social Security proceeds and putting it into the private sector."

When asked by Tony Snow on Fox News, "Are you opposed to letting people make the investment decisions? In

other words, having some component where they say, I will save the money rather than letting Uncle Sam doing it for me?" Senator REID in 1999: "I think it is important that we look, and I am totally in favor to do this. And, in fact, there are a couple of programs now that we are taking a look at to see if it works for Social Security."

Now, I agree in my heart that there is opportunity for negotiations, but simply saying "no" by the Democrats is unacceptable to every senior and every future generation to follow.

EDUCATION FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHL of New York). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 23, I read a disturbing story in *The Oregonian* newspaper. It was not about the war in Iraq, the rise of unemployment in Oregon, or even the growing problem with methamphetamine abuse. Instead, this story focused on a school fundraiser.

What was so disturbing about this fundraiser is that the students and their parents at Redland Elementary School in Oregon City were hosting a jog-a-thon to raise money to hire a physical education teacher. It was not for band uniforms, not for supplies, or even for a field trip; it was to hire a teacher. The parents and students have hosted this fundraiser every year since 1994 when the school district no longer had enough money to pay for a PE teacher.

Sadly, this is not the first tale of such fundraisers in Oregon. In 2003, the Eugene Register-Guard reported on similar efforts of parents who were hosting fundraisers to pay for a math teacher. Math classes were jeopardized because the then current math teacher was retiring and there was not enough money to hire a new math teacher. The parents and teachers decided to give their blood to fund the position. That is right, blood. After realizing that bake sales would not raise enough money, parents and teachers decided to sell their blood plasma to raise money to fund a teacher.

When it comes to education funding, it is increasingly parents and teachers who are scrambling to cover budget shortfalls; and, unfortunately, Oregon has been one of the States hit hardest by budget shortfalls. Across our State, schools are closing, increasing class sizes, or eliminating or cutting music, art, athletics, marching band, and other important so-called "extra-curricular" activities.

Oregon's school districts have carved a total of almost 500 days or 12 million instructional hours off the 2003 school year, and at least 1,100 teacher positions have been lost so far. Oregon has abolished State tests for writing, math, and science in middle schools; and some schools have received no new textbooks since 1988.

Spanish is emerging as the sole option for Oregon students who want to study a foreign language, as budget cuts translate to reduced programs in languages such as German, French, Russian, Chinese, and Japanese.

In Douglas County, 80 new teaching positions were eliminated, class sizes are expected to increase from 20 or so students to the low 30s, and sports and other extracurricular activities are going to take a hit.

Yamhill High School in my congressional district saw average class size jump by 10 to 20 students. That is 10 to 20 more students in the average classroom.

A math teacher in Hillsboro has two classes that top out at 54 students in each class, and other classes throughout our State routinely have 40 or more students per class.

In Portland, high school students and their parents were running telethons and auctions and collecting recyclables to pay money for teacher salaries and basic supplies.

The Medford School District eliminated 23 staff members, including seven child development specialists, two school nurses, two psychologists, and several maintenance and secretarial positions; and the district will start charging each student, each student, \$100 to pay a fee per sport in high school and \$50 in middle school.

In Lake Oswego, families are paying as much as \$900 a year for their children to play high school sports.

In order to retain as many teachers as possible and to keep class sizes down, the Dallas school district was unable to purchase new textbooks. Many students were studying from textbooks older than themselves until an anonymous donor gave \$185,000 and provided 2,700 students with new science and math books. Other school districts have asked parents to help curb the supply shortage by pitching in a variety of items, including crayons and even toilet paper.

And after Junction City School District cut art, music, and gym classes, laid off three teachers, and eliminated all field trips, some local male farmers ages 40 to 70 decided to drop everything, Full Monty style, by modeling for a nude pin-up calendar to raise money for schools.

These stories would be funny if they were not so deeply disturbing. We have a responsibility so that our children can get their education, and we should not be relying on parents to do bake sales, students to do jog-a-thons, parents to do pin-up calendars, or, worst of all, blood sales to bridge budget gaps; but they are, and sadly, they are not the only ones making sacrifices. A couple of years ago, the teachers in the Portland public schools taught for 2 weeks without pay.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this Chamber to do a better job, and I urge my home State of Oregon to do a better job.

Parents, teachers, and community leaders continuously demonstrate their deep pride in

and commitment to public education. Most parents will make any sacrifice to ensure that their children receive a quality education. And I know that teachers want nothing more than to see their students learn. While this generosity and commitment are heartwarming and inspiring we should hang our heads in shame that our schools are so desperate that parents and teachers have to sell their blood, pose for pinups, or work without pay to provide our children with the education they deserve.

I ran for Congress to improve the quality and accessibility of our education system. I believe strongly that an education is the best investment that we can make in our children and for our future.

We already have a glimpse of what our future can bring.

We can now travel the globe in a matter of hours. Business transactions can be performed with the click of a mouse. And our cars have more computing power than the Apollo spacecraft.

In this fast paced, digital age, it is important that we provide our children with a high quality education that will equip them for what the future holds.

Since I have been in Congress, I have made over 200 visits to over a hundred schools, and I have talked to teachers, students and parents from all over Oregon. In every school I have visited, the parents, students and teachers all agreed about what works: quality teachers, small class size, high standards and shared accountability, parental and community involvement, and adequate and equitable funding.

That is why I introduced the Class Size Reduction Initiative, which would hire 100,000 new teachers to reduce class size to 18 students in kindergarten through third grade. As a result of this initiative, we were able to provide over \$3 billion to school districts all across the country, hiring over 30,000 teachers—including over 300 in Oregon. One of those new teachers was placed in Reedville Elementary School in Aloha and reduced class size in first grade 54–27 54–18.

Yet, today the Administration and the Majority Leadership in Congress are turning their backs on education. President Bush in his budget has proposed a cut of \$530 million in education. He has eliminated funding for the Class Size Reduction Initiative. In fact, of the 150 programs that the president has targeted for massive reduction or elimination, 50 of them are education programs. He also short-changes the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) by \$12 billion. That guarantees children will be left behind.

The Federal Government is not the only one at fault. States across the nation are also balancing their budgets on the backs of our children, and our schools.

We can and must do better for our children, for ourselves and for our future. Common sense tells us that we need to prepare our students for the future so that the United States will continue to prosper. But this issue is more than about staying economically competitive. An education is necessary for everyone's quality of life. It is necessary for our society and for our democracy.

I urge my colleagues to join me in fighting for high quality public education. Our children should not be short-changed. They should not be forced to jog to raise money for a PE teacher, their teachers should not be asked to

work for free, and their parents should not pose nude or be drained of blood to keep the schoolhouse doors open.

IN MEMORY OF VICE MAYOR KATHLEEN NICOLA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform this House and the people of this Nation of the passing of a dedicated public servant. The vice mayor of Fountain Hills, Arizona, Kathleen Nicola, passed away last week as the result of a boating accident.

A longtime Arizona resident, Kathleen Connelly Nicola moved to Lake Havasu City, Arizona, in June of 1967. After a move to Mesa in 1985, Kathleen and her family settled in Fountain Hills in 1989.

Kathleen's service to the town of Fountain Hills began in 1990 when she began working for the municipal court after a brief period of volunteering her services. During her tenure as administrator of the court over the following 9 years, Kathleen's extensive duties included budget preparation and day-to-day management of that court.

Kathleen's responsibilities likewise included the court's compliance with local, county, and State statutes, rules and administrative orders, in addition to statistical and financial reports; and with that involvement and background in government, Kathleen Nicola decided to run for the Fountain Hills Council in 2002, serving there with distinction, rising to the post of vice mayor prior to her tragic death last week.

Kathleen earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Justice Studies from the College of Public Programs from Arizona State University. She graduated from the Arizona School of Real Estate and Business, making a career change in the summer of 2000 to become a licensed real estate salesperson. A local real estate professional, Kathleen was an active member of the Fountain Hills Chamber of Commerce and the Scottsdale Association of Realtors.

Kathleen Nicola, one of those in America who understood that public service can be expressed through many avenues of citizen involvement, finally choosing to run for public office, serving as the vice mayor of the town she loved.

Residents of the fifth congressional district, the town of Fountain Hills join as one to express their sympathies and condolences to the Nicola family. And, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that all Americans would remember the Nicola family in their prayers during these difficult days.

The legacy of Kathleen Connelly Nicola, a woman called to service, service in her town, service in public office, service in her profession. She will be

long remembered, and she is most definitely missed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DEMOCRATS OUT OF MAINSTREAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to put the lie to House Democrat rhetoric. The Democrat leadership, from Howard Dean to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), claim that House Republicans are out of the mainstream. Well, Mr. Speaker, if we are out of the mainstream, they are swimming downriver in some backwoods tributary.

From a parent's right to know what their children are doing, to protecting citizens across the country from the growing threat of gang violence, the House Democrat leadership is simply out to lunch.

Eight pieces of landmark legislation that passed this House with strong support from rank-and-file Democrats, and still the minority leadership refuses to see the light. On every one of these important bills, the gentlewoman from California (Leader PELOSI) chose to vote against legislation that the vast majority of Americans, Democrats and Republicans alike, approve of.

Bankruptcy reform, 73 Democrats voted for it, but Leader PELOSI did not. Class action reform, 50 Democrats voted for it, but Leader PELOSI did not. The Gang Deterrence and Protection Act of 2005, 71 Democrats voted for it, but Leader PELOSI did not. A new energy policy for America, 41 Democrats voted for it, and, you guessed it, Leader PELOSI did not. Protecting a parent's right to know before their daughter has an abortion, 54 Democrats voted for it, and Leader PELOSI did not.

It is as simple as this, Mr. Speaker. The House Democrat leadership is engaged in a strategy designed to do one and only one thing: prevent any and all action sponsored by Republicans from becoming law. Their obstruction of House Republicans' solutionist agenda shows just how far out of the mainstream they really are.

Mr. Speaker, it would be one thing if House Democrats tried to block legislation based on policy disagreements, but it is quite another for them to block legislation based on politics. And that, Mr. Speaker, is just what they are doing.

Democrats believe they can win at the ballot box by obstructing, and they would rather win the next election than move America forward. Make no

mistake: the votes I just spoke about are telling. Rank-and-file Democrats, those who believe what is best for America is more important than election politics, are brave in their defiance of their leaders. They understand that simply being the Democrat Party of No will not increase our security, build our economy, or create jobs.

If you need more proof, just look at retirement security. Republicans, led by President Bush, have the foresight to address the looming crisis facing tomorrow's retirees. We know that sometime in the near future, our Social Security system will be bankrupt.

□ 1700

If we do not make tough decisions now, future Americans will have to make even tougher ones. But Democrats just do not see a problem. Or is it that they would rather pretend there is not one?

When President Bush announced his intention to reform Social Security, he and other Republicans crossed the country to engage the American people in dialogue. He declared that nothing was off the table and signaled his willingness to consider any and all options. The Democrat response: refusal to come to the negotiating table.

One poll shows that by 61 percent to 29 percent Americans under 40 say that Social Security needs to be fixed. At the same time, many in the minority stick to their head-in-the-sand argument that there is no problem. Democrat leaders are not only out of the American mainstream, but are also out of the Democratic mainstream. Yet they have the gumption to accuse Republicans of being out of touch.

The American people must not buy into the Democrat rhetoric. They are doing a lot of talking. But do not confuse activity for achievement. What tangible results can the minority point to? The answer is none. They have no agenda. They have no vision and they have a fundamental misunderstanding of the issues we face as a Nation.

Democrats, not Republicans, Mr. Speaker, are the ones who are out of the mainstream.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMANN of New York). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2566. An act to provide an extension of highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment

of a law reauthorizing the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century.

EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, we want to spend some moments this evening talking about a subject which is a very high priority for a lot of Americans, including a number of us here in the Congress, and that has to do with embryonic stem cell research. I want to start out by telling you what the essence of a bill that we have dropped is. We filed this bill a couple of days ago. And then I will come back to this later on, to a more detailed discussion of it.

What I have here, Mr. Speaker, is a little depiction of what happens in the human body. This shows one-half of the reproductive tract of a female. This would be replicated, mirror image, on the other side, because here we are seeing only one ovary and one Fallopian tube and one-half of the uterus; and what this depicts, Mr. Speaker, is the sequence of events in the fertilization and the growth and the ultimate implantation of the embryo, this whole trip, not an unharmed trip for the embryo, because not all of them make that trip successfully.

In fact, probably about as many as two-thirds of those that are fertilized here never are implanted down in the uterus. But this is a sequence of events which takes 10 days, perhaps, to make the trip down to finally be implanted in the uterus.

Fertilization, as is noted here, occurs very far up in the Fallopian tube, and then there is a single cell called a zygote, and that splits to form two cells. They split to form four cells and eight cells. And we are going to come back and talk about those eight cells because that is the focus of a lot of attention in today's world, particularly in infertility clinics where they are doing in vitro fertilization.

Let us imagine now that that sequence of events is not occurring in the uterus and the fallopian tube of the mother, but it is occurring in a petri dish in the laboratory. For some reason, the mother cannot become pregnant, and so they, with the use of hormones, take eggs, generally more than one, from the mother, and they take sperm, of which there are millions, from the male, and they expose these eggs to sperm, and they are fertilized. And so the doctor has a number, generally several, of these fertilized embryos. And he looks under a microscope and determines the embryos which look the strongest, and then he implants them in the mother.

Because not every embryo takes when it is implanted in the mother, he

will usually implant more than one. One of my good friends here in the Congress, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), his wife had three babies because all of the embryos that were implanted took. And so now they are the very happy parents of triplets that were born.

Well, at this eight-cell stage, in clinics, it started in England a couple of years ago; it has now spread to this country. At the eight-cell stage, the doctors are able, with a very fine pipette, to remove a cell or two from that embryo, and they then do a genetic diagnosis on that cell. It is called a preimplantation genetic diagnosis because they are doing it before they implant the embryo in the uterus. The parents want to make sure that their baby is not going to have a genetic defect. If there is no genetic defect, they put the egg, minus a cell or two, in the uterus. And more than 600 times in the clinic in England, and well more than 1,000 times worldwide, we have had a perfectly normal baby born.

Now, the hope is that ultimately, but that is not what our bill is. I will come to that in a moment. The hope is, ultimately you could take that cell and do two other things with it, that cell or two that you have removed. One of the other things that you would do with it is to establish a repair kit for your baby.

We are now attempting to sort of do that when we are freezing umbilical cord blood, Mr. Speaker, and I know you have heard of that, with the hope that the stem cells, they are not really a true embryonic stem cell because they are already differentiated somewhat, that is, they have already decided ultimately what they are going to be, at least to some measure, that the baby can get, or the adult later on can get, some help from that.

We hope that we will be able to develop a repair kit from the cell that is taken. If that is true, then you could take some of the cells from the repair kit to produce a new stem cell line.

And as you know, Mr. Speaker, we are now down to 22 stem cell lines of humans that we can use Federal money working with. They are all contaminated with mouse "feeder" cells, and so there is a need in the medical research community for additional stem cell lines.

There is, Mr. Speaker, the hint of a moral ethical problem here, and that is that maybe the cell that I take out of this eight-cell-stage embryo could, under proper circumstances, become another embryo and, therefore, another baby. There is some cause to reflect on that, Mr. Speaker, because nature, on occasion, at some point between the two-cell stage and the inner cell mass, which is clear down here, will split the embryo and then end up with two embryos, and obviously, half of the cells went to each embryo and those half cells, each one, develops into a perfectly normal identical twin.

But if we could take the cell for preimplantation genetic diagnosis, if

we could take that cell from the inner cell mass, then it is already differentiated, so that it cannot produce decidua.

Now the decidua, Mr. Speaker, is the amnion, chorion. These are elements of the placenta. And already the cells that are the inner cell mass, which will become the baby, have lost the ability to produce the decidua, so there would be no concern that the cells you took could produce another embryo and, if implanted, another baby.

Our bill looks only at animal experimentation because we need to determine several things. First of all, we need to determine, can you, in fact, from these single cells? By the way, one of the additional advantages of the inner cell mass is that there are a lot of cells there. So you could potentially take much more than one cell, which would give you an enhanced capability of producing a stem cell line and a repair kit, because these cells do not like being alone. And what we want to do is have animal experimentation on nonhuman primates, which are the great apes, which are 99.99 percent genetically identical to humans. That may reflect something on who you think you are, but the truth is that the gene differences between the great apes and humans is very, very small.

If, in fact, we can do these things with cells taken from embryos and cells taken from nonhuman primates, then we will have increased confidence that it will be safe in humans, that we can, in fact, develop the repair kit and the stem cell line that we would like to develop.

Let me take just a moment, and then I am going to recognize my friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY). Let me take just a moment to talk about what stem cells are.

There are fundamentally two types of stem cells. There are adult stem cells and there are embryonic stem cells. Here we show the growth of the embryo, and as you notice, there are fewer stages here than that previous chart we had, because they have skipped the morula and they go to the blastula, and then they skip the gastrula, well, here is the gastrula, and then they go on to the three germ layers.

These cells start differentiating. They first differentiate into the inner cell mass and the tissues which will become the decidua, and then the inner cell mass differentiates into three types of cells, the ectoderm and the mesoderm and the endoderm. And at the bottom here it shows the kinds of tissues that will develop from those.

From ectoderm will develop your skin and your nervous system, the brain and spinal cord and all the nerves that run to and fro in the body.

From the mesoderm, that is in the middle. From the mesoderm the middle layer will develop most of what you are, all of your muscle, all of your bone, all of your heart and so forth, the smooth muscle of your gut.

And then we have small but important contributions of the endoderm.

And this is some of the glands in the body and the lining of the digestive system and the lining of the lungs and so forth.

Now, adult stem cells, and a good example of those is a stem cell that produces red blood cells here, that cell produces more than that. It is in the bone marrow and it produces red blood cells. It produces the thrombocytes for clotting. It produces the polymorphonuclear leukocytes, that is some of the white cells.

Now, maybe you can take that stem cell, which is not totally differentiated, and you can put it in an environment where it will be confused as to what it really is, so that it might be able to produce for you something else. And that is what we do, at least partially, with adult stem cells.

The embryonic stem cell is a cell taken from the embryo no later than the blastocyst, which has the inner cell mass, because only then will it be purely embryonic.

In the morula, the eight-cell stage we talked about, it is totally undifferentiated. Conceivably, it might produce an embryo. The President's Commission on Bioethics does not think so, but conceivably, it might. But if you take that cell or cells from the inner cell mass, it certainly will not, because it is already differentiated to the point that these cells in the inner cell mass will become the baby, and these cells in the trophoblast will become the decidua, the amnion and chorion, the placenta.

Mr. Speaker, now I would like to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I want to, first of all, thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT). And I want to tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, how enthused I am to be an original cosponsor on H.R. 2574, the Respect for Life Embryonic Stem Cell Act of 2005.

□ 1715

I think that the gentleman has an excellent idea of solving this moral, ethical problem that we spent so much time talking about on the floor of this great body yesterday in the passage of those two pieces of legislation, the one, of course, to expand the opportunity for obtaining umbilical cord blood with up to 150,000 umbilical cord banks that would communicate with each other in regard to trying to match the stem cells obtained in that blood to the specific recipient who is suffering from one of these terrible diseases that we have heard so much about. I am talking about things like juvenile type I diabetes. I am talking about spinal cord injuries, Alzheimer's, leukemia.

That was the one bill. And, of course, also in that bill would expand the banking ability of bone marrow where adult stem cells are plentiful. That bill I think passed this body with maybe one dissenting vote out of 435. That does not happen very often that you get such a unanimous support.

The other bill, of course, the Castle/DeGette bill, is the one that caused a great controversy, consternation. Not partisan concern, because we had Members, both Republican and Democratic Members, for and opposed to that bill. Indeed, the authors were the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), a Republican Member, and the co-author, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), a Democrat; so it was a very, I think, in some ways it was a good thing even though I was very, very much opposed to the bill and disappointed to be on the losing side. There were 194 of us, though, who felt very strongly that we did not want to go in that direction of destroying embryos, even though the proponents, Mr. Speaker, used the term, hey, these are throwaway babies.

I even heard somebody say in their time in the well, Mr. Speaker, that these embryos, these frozen embryos were just going to be flushed down the toilet. Well, as we know, my colleagues know this week we had, I do not know how many of the hundred snowflake babies, the babies that infertile couples have adopted, the frozen embryos with the permission of the natural parents and carried these precious children to term. I think 22 of them were roaming around Capitol Hill yesterday and had an opportunity to be over at the White House with President Bush. You ask one of those moms or dads if those were throwaway babies. Indeed, they were not. They were precious lives. And I am just so thankful that that opportunity is there.

I will say this, if my colleague from Maryland will permit me to digress just a little bit on this subject, reproductive endocrinologists are superspecialist OB/GYNs. Their work involves primarily infertility. And they are wonderful doctors. They are so well trained and it is amazing the things that they can do with infertile couples, whether the infertility is a female problem with a sparsity or lack of sufficient number of eggs or whether it is a male infertility where the sperm count is extremely low, and maybe like in 25 percent of the cases you just do not know. But the success rates that they achieve is remarkable.

One of the most exciting things that they do and have been doing now for, gosh, 15, almost 20, years is in vitro fertilization. But when they first started that technology of actually stimulating a woman's ovaries to produce multiple eggs, not without some risks because when you do that with injections, the ovaries swell, they get quite large, and of course there is some danger there, as all of us in the medical profession, especially the OB/GYNs know, Mr. Speaker. But they do. It is called hyperstimulation when it gets to the dangerous stage. But even before that, it is superstimulation so that they can obtain multiple eggs.

So then there is this fertilization in the petri dish, whether it is the husband's sperm or the donor sperm if the

husband is azospermic, has no sperm. So you are getting really so many of these fertilized eggs, many more than you can safely put back into the uterus. And that has created, really in a way, somewhat of a dilemma with these so-called throwaway frozen embryos, some 100,000 of them.

I think I want to hopefully sometime soon talk to my colleagues in that specialty of reproductive endocrinology and say, first of all, there should be a limit to the number of embryos that can actually be implanted in a woman's uterus, and you should never put more in than they can safely conceive.

What has been done in this country and others is if all of the sudden six or eight are implanted with the hopes that two or three or maybe just one will take and be a successful pregnancy, in those situations where to and behold five or more take, then what is typically recommended is something called "pregnancy reduction" where the doctor is able to go in actually at a certain stage with a needle and destroy two or three or four sort of indiscriminately. Not knowing whether you were getting the boys or the girls or an equal mix of the same or the most intelligent or the least intelligent, the one that will grow up to be a doctor or the one that will grow up to be a lawyer. Pretty unethical in my estimation, Mr. Speaker, a pretty unethical procedure to be doing or recommending to a couple. And I think that we need to get away from that.

We need to be a little more careful and only implant a total number so that if every one of them took, that it would be safe for them to carry to near term so that all of those children would survive. And also in getting into the situation that maybe, Mr. Speaker, couples need more counseling when they go to their reproductive endocrinologist and they sign up for IVF, in vitro fertilization, maybe they need a little more counseling as to, well, how many children do you hope to have. And if they say, well, only two; I would certainly not want to have more than two children, then I think it is unethical to do this egg retrieval process and get 10 or 12 eggs and fertilize all of them and then freeze the extras when the couple had absolutely no intention of ever having a family of six or eight or 10 children.

Now, some people do. We have a Member on our side of the aisle, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI), who has 12 precious children, and he is still a young man. But it is an amazing thing that we have really created this problem ourselves by not regulating this specialty.

So I have digressed a little bit and I hope the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) will understand. I wanted to make that point because I think it is very important. But what the gentleman recommended here, this is not some mad scientific proposal. Not at all. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is one of the most

thoughtful Members of this body, Mr. Speaker, and I think colleagues on both sides of the aisle recognize that.

He is serving in his seventh term. He is not a rookie. He is a very, very bright Ph.D., physiologist, who taught in medical school. He has taken advanced course work in embryology, so he does understand, Mr. Speaker. He is thinking about what can we do to solve this problem where we in this country do not have to fight about this moral, ethical divide. He does not want us to have to cross that divide and we do not have to.

So I really commend the gentleman, and this bill I have great support for because we need some studies and we need Federal funding of those studies and we are not destroying a human life in the process. So his allowing me to come and spend a few minutes here to be with him to discuss this is most appreciated on my part.

I plan to stay here for a little while and if the gentleman would like for me to comment further, I would be glad to do so.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much. I am honored he has come, and I really appreciate your articulate description of the situation we are in in the country where I think that a vast majority of Americans believe that there is considerable potential from embryonic stem cell research. And yet we have this big divide in our country where a lot of our citizens in this country and a lot of our Members here in the Congress have real problems taking a life, the life of one of these early embryos.

By the way, this has in it the blueprint for a completely unique individual. There are now 6½ billion people in the world and no two alike. And so each of these embryos created in the laboratory has in it a completely unique genetic blueprint. It is not that we know which of these embryos is going to be implanted because they are frozen, could be implanted in the future. But one thing we do know, one thing we do know is that if you take the embryo and destroy it, that that potential life is gone.

Now you may argue, you may argue that you really ought to opt for the greater good and there could be enormous potential from embryonic stem cell research. If that were the only argument, Mr. Speaker, I would engage in that argument, but it is not because we do not have to kill embryos. You do not have to hurt embryos to get stem cell lines.

I have here a piece today from Roll Call which is kind of an inside paper here on the Hill. And it is quoting from freshman Senator TOM COBURN. He is a freshman there because fairly recently he was here in the House. He came in 2 years after I came in. He is a doctor. He has delivered a lot of babies in Oklahoma. And I called him the other day and he said, I will carry this bill in the Senate.

This is what he is quoted as saying in Roll Call just today: "Coburn said, It is possible to harvest stem cells without destroying embryos and would focus his efforts on amending the bill," that is the bill that will be going through the Senate, "amending the bill to promote this procedure."

I also want to note in this week's edition of Time magazine, the first story, a pretty big story on stem cells, "Why Bush's Ban Could Be Reversed." Now, we voted yesterday to reverse that ban. It needs to be voted in the Senate, and then it needs to go to conference and then it needs to go to the President's desk and the President has assured the world that he will veto this because of his respect for life.

I hope that the bill we are discussing tonight reaches the President's desk at the same time as the bill we voted on yesterday so the President has before him the option of signing a bill which opens up all of the promises of embryonic stem cell medical application and still preserves life.

I want to emphasize again, Mr. Speaker, that our bill deals only with the animal experimentation because we want to know that in fact it is efficacious and safe to do the procedures that will need to be done if we are going to reach the potential for medical application of embryonic stem cells.

I would like to for just a moment talk about the general potential from stem cells, whether they are embryonic or whether they are adult stem cells.

□ 1730

There are two basic kinds of diseases in the body. There are diseases from tissue or organ deficiencies, and there are diseases from pathogens. Mostly what we are talking about are diseases from tissue or organ deficiencies, although if there is a pathogen that destroys an organ or a tissue and it might be replaced through embryonic or adult stem cell application, that would be included also. But there are a large number of diseases that represent tissue or organ deficiencies, which appear to hold promise for stem cell medical application.

My colleague mentioned Type 1 diabetes. This is really a very tragic disease. It represents the largest cost of any disease in our country. I see diabetics come through my office and the most heart-wrenching are those little children, juvenile diabetes, sometimes very virulent. They have to sample, several times a day, their blood.

Thank God, we have improved techniques which require just a fraction of a drop of blood. And they have, many of them, embedded in their side a little hockey-puck-size pump that pumps insulin. But they have to sample their blood to know what the sugar level is so they know how to set the pump, so it is pumping the right dose of insulin. This they have to do 24 hours a day. And some of them are so brittle that they have to wake up at night to do this.

When they come to your office with diseases like this, or like multiple sclerosis, or like lateral sclerosis that my grandmother died from, then your heart really goes out to these people. I remember my grandmother's death. I was a teenager. They had misdiagnosed it for quite a while, because this is Lou Gehrig's disease, and it was not all that common. When they finally figured out what it was, there was nothing that could be done for it. We hope in the future, with stem cell application, there will be something that can be done for it.

My grandmother went from falling now and then to degenerating slowly, until just before she died the only motion she had was blinking her eyes. And that was the only way she could communicate with us. One blink for "yes," two blinks for "no."

So from a personal perspective, and I suspect many families are like my family, that they have a relative, if not a relative, a friend who has one of these many diseases, diabetes, multiple sclerosis, lateral sclerosis, or Alzheimer's disease.

And, Mr. Speaker, there are a whole host. I have here 63 different autoimmune diseases. These are diseases where the body gets confused as to what is really body. You see, very early in our embryonic development there are certain miracle cells in our body called T-cells that are imprinted with who we are. And that is very essential, because in the future there are going to be a lot of foreign invaders, mainly bacteria and particularly viruses, that would like to occupy us and live there comfortably without being rejected; and that, of course, would be hazardous and frequently fatal. So these T-cells are imprinted with who we are so that they reject everything that is not us.

Well, in many people, and there are 63 diseases here that are listed, in many people these immune reactions get confused, and so we have what are called autoimmune diseases where the body starts attacking its own tissues. Well, the body marshals its resources and many times it has overcome this deficiency, but by that time, the tissues are decimated. So we have the potential that we could provide enormous medical help in a great number of diseases.

There is another potential, which is much debated and explored, and that is the potential difference between adult stem cells and embryonic stem cells. And there are many people who will tell you that adult stem cells have the most potential because they have presently the most medical applications, 58 as compared to zero for embryonic stem cells. The reason for that, Mr. Speaker, or at least one reason, is that we have been working with adult stem cells for over 3 decades and just over 6 years with embryonic stem cells. And so there has not really been time for medical applications.

But all of the professionals in the area will tell you that, theoretically,

because of what embryonic stem cells are, embryonic stem cells way back here in early development of the embryo, that they retain, or they have the ability to make any and every tissue in the body. So, theoretically, they ought to have the most potential.

You will hear, Mr. Speaker, debates on this issue, and it is well to remember that from a teleological perspective, the embryonic stem cells ought to have more application than adult stem cells, which is why all the clamor, why the \$3 billion in California voted by the voters for embryonic stem cell research, because the professionals and most people who think about it believe that there is more potential from embryonic stem cells. There may not be, but that is why we need to do the research so that we know what is feasible here.

I just want to spend a moment, Mr. Speaker, going over my personal involvement with this field. As was mentioned by my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), I was privileged in a former life to work in a scientific medical environment. I taught medical school for 4 years, I taught postgraduate medicine at the School of Aviation Medicine in Pensacola, Florida. I had the opportunity, while studying for my doctorate, to take a course in advanced embryology. And so when I went to NIH in 2001 with a group from the Hill here, most of them staff members, quite a large number as I remember, for a briefing at NIH on the potential for embryonic stem cell applications, and this was in 2001 before the President came down with his executive order that we could not kill any more embryos; that there were 60 cell lines, maybe not quite 60, but 60 cell lines in existence and that Federal money could be spent only on those, we knew then that these cell lines would eventually run out.

Now they are down to 22 and all of them contaminated with mouse "feeder" cells, so there is now a need, if this research is going to continue with Federal funding, there is a need for additional stem cell lines. That is why the bill yesterday and why the bill that we are talking about today.

Because I remembered my embryology, and the next chart here will show what happens with ordinary twinning with fraternal twins, in fraternal twins there are two eggs, and those two eggs may implant in the uterus far apart, in which case the babies will present in separate amnions, or they may implant in the uterus close together so that they will present with a single chorion, I guess it is.

The next chart shows what happens in identical twinning. In identical twinning, early in the development of the embryo, and you will remember the first chart we looked at that went from one cell to two to four to eight, then 16 and on to the inner-cell mass stage, and the embryo can divide at either the two-cell stage or clear up to the inner-cell mass stage. And the little chart here shows two inner-cell masses.

The cell at which it divides determines how the babies will present. Here you see you have two babies in the same chorion and they mimic the two babies that were fraternal twins that happened to implant in the uterus close together. Well, I knew, Mr. Speaker, that in both of these cases half of the cells were taken away from the developing embryo either at the two-cell stage or anything in between clear up to the inner-cell mass, and there are a lot of stages in between here. And when you took half the cells away, the half you took away made a perfectly normal baby, and the half that was left made a perfectly normal baby: identical twins.

So it was reasonable to me that you ought to be able to take a cell or two or three or so away and the cells that were left ought to produce a perfectly normal baby. And I asked NIH researchers, is this theoretically possible? They said, yes, it is theoretically possible.

A few days later I happened to be at an event with the President, and I knew he was struggling with this decision. So I mentioned to him my visit to NIH and the possibility that this could be done. The President handed the follow-up to this to Karl Rove, and so Karl Rove went to NIH.

Now, I did not know he was involved until he called me and he said, Roscoe, they tell me at NIH they cannot do this. I said, Karl, either they did not understand the question or there is some confusion, because these are the same people that can take a nucleus out of a single cell and put another nucleus in it. That is what people do in cloning, and this is now done widely since that Dolly sheep up there in Scotland.

In fact, I went to a farm in Maryland that has two cloned cows, and it may be unique in all the world. They have a heifer there, born to a cloned cow, fertilized by a cloned bull.

So I knew that it was possible to go in and do this. But they told him again, no, they could not do it. So the President came out with his executive order saying we could use only the stem cell lines in existence.

Subsequent to that, a couple years later, in my office talking about this with NIH, they admitted that there was some confusion that permitted Mr. Rove to believe something that they had not said. What they told him was that they were not sure that we could make a stem cell line from such an early embryo, at the eight-cell stage. We make them all the time, by the way, from the inner-cell mass. That is the stage at which they do this. That is true. That is why I wanted then and want now to do the animal experimentation to determine whether this is true or not.

I have here a letter, and I submitted this for the RECORD the last time we spoke about this, so I will not do it again, but this is a letter from Dr. Battey, who is the NIH spokesman, the

point person for embryonic stem cell work. It is a large, 3-page letter in which he discusses a number of the things that we are discussing here this evening, Mr. Speaker.

There are several statements in his letter which indicate the probability that what we want to do in fact can be done, which could have enormous potential applications for good to the people that have diseases that could be cured, well, maybe not cured, but where defective tissues and organs could be replaced.

We were talking about diabetes, Mr. Speaker. That has a really high potential application. The problem in the diabetic is that the cells of Langerhans, these are little island cells. They are called the islands of Langerhans for the gentleman who first described them. They happen to be located in the pancreas. They do not need to be there. They have nothing to do with what the pancreas does.

The pancreas secretes a large number of enzymes in the intestine that help digest all three classes of food in the intestine: fats, carbohydrates, and protein. The islands of Langerhans, if we could make them from stem cells and they could be placed in people, anywhere, their earlobe, their groin, under the skin in their side, anywhere, they would then secrete the insulin that is so essential.

And by the way, it is more than just insulin, because giving insulin to a diabetic prolongs their life and helps a great deal, but it does not cure the disease. There still would be potential eye problems and potential circulation problems. Many people, Mr. Speaker, have friends and relatives that have diabetes and they see this progression.

What we want to do in our bill is to provide an opportunity to explore in nonhuman primates the potential for making a repair kit so that that individuals, through all of their life, would have the possibility of applications with completely genetically compatible material. And then with surplus cells from the repair kit, we could establish new embryonic stem cell lines. But our research aims only at the animal experiments which would determine the efficacy and the safety of doing this.

There is debate, and you, Mr. Speaker, heard the debate yesterday. That was a really good illustration of something my wife notes frequently, that during those debates everything has been said, but they go on and on because everybody has not said it. We heard yesterday people from both sides repeating. And since repetition is the soul of learning, I am sure the message from both sides got through.

And what was that message? From the side that voted for the Castle bill, the message was that we have 400,000 frozen embryos out there. They are not all going to be used; some will die because they are frozen too long.

□ 1745

Ultimately, some will be discarded so why should we not get some potential

medical benefit since they are going to be discarded?

The argument on the other side, and I am on the other side because I have a true reverence for life, the argument on the other side is that for any one of those 400,000 embryos, you do not know that is not the embryo that could be adopted in the snowflake operation and become a much longed for and loved child.

At the end of the day, if you have taken one of these embryos and destroyed it in your pursuit of embryonic stem cell research, you have destroyed the potential life of a unique individual with a genetic blueprint unlike any other individual on the planet, another Albert Einstein, another Ronald Reagan. I think the reverence for life argues very strongly in favor of the President's position that he will veto the bill.

I hope that my bill can get to his desk at the same time because this is a bill that is reverent of life, and everything that is done is done for the benefit of the embryo. The parents cannot conceive normally, so they have in vitro fertilization. They would like to know, since they have the ability to know, that their baby is not going to have a genetic defect. So what happens to the embryo with the genetic defect?

Mr. Speaker, I hope it is refrozen and made available for adoption. There are many people in the world that get genuine fulfillment in adopting children that are handicapped. That is why they adopt crack cocaine babies or babies with AIDS. I would not want to preclude that this baby with a genetic defect might not be wanted by another family. If the family decides that they want to ensure that their baby is going to have a high quality of life and does pre-implantation genetic diagnosis, if the potential is there, and our research in animals will help determine that, if the potential is there, they will certainly go on to develop a repair kit so their baby will have more than just a potential of frozen cord blood. And then once they have established the repair kit, hopefully if it is needed, they will donate a few cells so we can start another stem cell line to do the research and the medical applications that are necessary to determine the full potential of embryonic stem cells in medicine.

Mr. Speaker, I want to spend a few moments on a white paper produced by the President's Council on Bioethics called "Alternative Sources of Pluripotent Stem Cells." What it really means is you can go into this early embryo that I talked about, and let me put that up on the board. This is from page 25 in their paper. The highlighted part says it may be some time before stem cell lines can be reliably derived from single cells. If we go to the cell mass stage, we may be able to get several cells since there are a lot of them there. And, of course, our chances will be enhanced with single cells extracted from early embryos and in ways that do no harm to the embryo.

So they are saying this is possible. But the initial success of the Verlinsky Group's effort, and this is a group that says they have done this, that needs to be corroborated by other scientists, and our research would determine whether or not that is feasible through animal experimentation; but it raises the future possibility that pluripotent stem cells could be derived from single blastomeres removed from early human embryos without apparently harming them.

They do a really good job of talking about the potential opportunities, and I want to note the asterisk; and a similar idea was proposed by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) as far back as 2001. This was a suggestion that I made to the people at NIH and then to the President, and that was well before the President came down with his executive order on the stem cell lines that could be used for further experimentation with Federal money.

They do a really good job in the body of this text. They talk about all of the potential benefits. They talk about developing the repair kit and taking cells in the repair kit to produce the stem cell line. And they said here at the beginning of it that all of this may be possible. But then it almost looks to me like somebody else wrote their recommendation section because going to the back to the recommendation section, they said the second proposal, blastomere extraction from living embryos, we find this proposal to be ethically unacceptable in humans owing to the reasons given. We would not impose risk on living embryos destined to become children for the sake of getting stem cells for research.

Mr. Speaker, that is not what they said in the first part of it. They said they were getting the stem cells to do preimplantation genetic diagnosis and getting the stem cells to develop a repair kit. I, too, have some concern about getting cells if the only reason for getting the cells is for research, but that is not the reason that the parents decide to do preimplantation genetic diagnosis; they do that because they want to have a baby that does not have a genetic defect.

That is not the reason that they have the cells cultured to produce a repair kit, because they want their baby to have the potential miracle of embryonic stem cells for the rest of their life. It is only at that time, after successful animal experimentation, as outlined in our bill, it is only at that time you would ask the parents, if you have surplus cells from your repair kit, might we start a stem cell line with them.

So although they do a very good job of discussing in the body of the text, please go back to the body of the text and read what they said there because they really short circuit the whole thing in their recommendations because the presumption in the recommendation is that we are taking the cells only for research. That was never the presumption, that we were taking the cells only for research.

In closing, I would like to look again, and this is a different chart, but it shows the same sequence of events, come back to what we are proposing so there is no misunderstanding of what we are proposing.

Again, I will go through what happens in normal fertilization, and then you have to imagine this is not occurring in the body of the mother, but it is occurring in a petri dish in a laboratory, in a fertility clinic.

This is the ovary and this is the funnel end called the infundibulum and this is the fallopian tube, and we come down to the uterus. This is half of the uterus, and there is a mirror image on this on the other side. It takes about 10 days until the egg implants in the uterus.

This is occurring now in the petri dish. We know at the 8-cell stage here that you can take a cell or two out, they have done it more than a thousand times, and get a perfectly normal baby after taking that cell or two out for preimplantation genetic diagnosis.

There is the possibility, although the authors of the "Alternative Sources of Pluripotent Stem Cells" argue that it is probably not possible, but there is a faint possibility, perhaps, if you put this in the proper environment you might have another embryo. Therefore, you start the ethical argument all over again.

But if you can wait, and I believe you can, if you wait until the inner cell mass to take that cell, now you have completely avoided that argument because at the inner cell mass there has already been enough differentiation that the cells in the inner cell mass will become the baby, but they can only become the baby if there are the cells in the trophoblast which will produce the decidua which is the amnion and the chorion, and they have not yet done this because there is no reason to do this. The inner cell mass stage is the stage at which the embryos are ordinarily taken to produce stem cell lines.

Again, our bill deals only with animal experimentation in nonhuman primates, and those are the great apes which I emphasized previously were genetically very similar, and they are widely used in research that would affect humans to determine the efficacy and the safety of those procedures on humans.

I would like to return for just a moment to the fundamentals of this debate: Christopher Reeves, Ronald Reagan, ever so many people out there that have diseases that one can imagine could be cured with applications of stem cell research. The real challenge is to be able to do that without what I think is a morally unacceptable procedure of destroying another potential human being in doing that. I know that there are 400,000 embryos out there. I know that not all of them will probably be implanted; but for any one of those embryos, Mr. Speaker, it could be implanted. It could be tomorrow's

Albert Einstein; it could be tomorrow's Ronald Reagan.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be in the position of making the decision that it is okay to take this potential baby, it is a life, to take this potential baby and destroy it because in doing so I might help some other people. We do not have to do that because as Dr. Coburn said in the Senate and as this letter from NIH says, it is completely feasible that we can reach these objectives by taking cells from an early embryo for the benefit of the embryo. Let me stress again that these cells would be taken at the parents' request to benefit their baby, to do a preimplantation genetic diagnosis to develop a repair kit.

Mr. Speaker, it would be wonderful if the 6.5 million people in the world today had repair kits. How much human suffering could be alleviated by that. The parents would have made these three decisions: in vitro fertilization because they cannot have a baby otherwise; to do a preimplantation genetic diagnosis because they want a baby that is going to have the highest possible quality of life; and to develop a repair kit. It is only at that time that we would ask them if you have surplus cells from your repair kit, might we not start another stem cell line with them.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to emphasize that our bill is just preparatory to all of this because it deals with none of this. It deals only with the animal experimentation that would determine the efficacy of developing repair kits and stem cell lines from this early embryo.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I have now cosponsors on both sides of the aisle, hopefully we will have a large number of cosponsors because this bill meets both the objectives and the objections of any Member who is concerned with the potential for embryonic stem cell application to medicine.

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2005 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2005 THROUGH FY 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMAN of New York). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2005 and for the five-year period of fiscal years 2005 through 2009. This report is necessary to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act. This status report is current through May 23, 2005.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

The first table in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays,

and revenues with the aggregate levels set forth by H. Con. Res. 95, the conference report on the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2005 because those years are not considered for enforcement of spending aggregates.

The second table compares, by authorizing committee, the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discretionary action with the "section 302(a)" allocations made under H. Con. Res. 95 for fiscal year 2005 and fiscal years 2005 through 2009. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discre-

tionary appropriations for fiscal year 2005 with the total of "section 302(b)" suballocations among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures reported by the Appropriations Committee that would breach its section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2005 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 95

(Reflecting action completed as of May 23, 2005—On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year—2005	Fiscal years 2005–2009
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	2,078,456	(1)
Outlays	2,056,006	(1)
Revenues	1,483,658	8,519,748
Current Level:		
Budget Authority	2,073,350	(1)
Outlays	2,055,934	(1)
Revenues	1,484,065	8,603,391
Current Level over (+) / under (–) Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	–5,106	(1)
Outlays	–72	(1)
Revenues	407	83,643

¹ Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2006 through 2009 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing new budget authority for FY 2005 in excess of \$5,106,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2005 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of measures providing new outlays for FY 2005 in excess of \$72,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2005 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

REVENUES

Enactment of measures that would reduce revenue for FY 2005 in excess of \$407,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

Enactment of measures resulting in revenue reduction for the period of fiscal years 2005 through 2009 in excess of \$83,643,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by H. Con. Res. 95.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF MAY 23, 2005

(Fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

House committee	2005		2005–2009 total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Armed Services:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Education and the Workforce:				
Allocation	0	0	400	400
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	–400	–400
Energy and Commerce:				
Allocation	0	0	1,525	1,525
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	–1,525	–1,525
Financial Services:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Government Reform:				
Allocation	0	0	50	50
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	–50	–50
House Administration:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
International Relations:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Judiciary:				
Allocation	0	0	6	6
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	–6	–6
Resources:				
Allocation	6	6	45	45
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	–6	–6	–45	–45
Science:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Small Business:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Transportation and Infrastructure:				
Allocation	3,488	0	12,238	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	–3,488	0	–12,238	0
Veterans' Affairs:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Ways and Means:				
Allocation	554	64	1,800	1,558
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	–554	–64	–1,800	–1,558

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUBALLOCATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

Appropriations subcommittee	302(b) suballocations ¹		Current level reflecting action completed as of May 23, 2005		Current level minus suballocations	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	n.a.	n.a.	18,689	18,844	n.a.	n.a.
Defense	n.a.	n.a.	352,127	398,270	n.a.	n.a.
Energy & Water Development	n.a.	n.a.	30,533	30,107	n.a.	n.a.
Foreign Operations	n.a.	n.a.	18,892	25,898	n.a.	n.a.
Homeland Security	n.a.	n.a.	38,469	31,925	n.a.	n.a.
Interior-Environment	n.a.	n.a.	26,969	26,874	n.a.	n.a.
Labor, HHS & Education	n.a.	n.a.	143,180	141,773	n.a.	n.a.
Legislative Branch	n.a.	n.a.	3,545	3,785	n.a.	n.a.
Military Quality of Life-Veterans Affairs	n.a.	n.a.	80,263	76,417	n.a.	n.a.
Science-State-Justice-Commerce	n.a.	n.a.	58,438	57,956	n.a.	n.a.
Transportation-Treasury-HUD-Judiciary-DC	n.a.	n.a.	67,873	117,669	n.a.	n.a.
Total (Section 302(a) Allocation)¹	840,036	929,520	838,978	929,518	-1,058	-2

¹ Appropriations Committee has not submitted the subcommittee allocations since the restructuring of the committee.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, May 26, 2005.

Hon. JIM NUSSLE,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2005 budget and is current through May 23, 2005. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions for fiscal year 2005 that underlie H. Con. Res. 95,

the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006. Pursuant to section 402 of that resolution, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the enclosed current level report excludes these amounts (see footnote 2 of the report).

Since my last letter, dated January 24, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following acts that changed budget authority, outlays, or revenues for fiscal year 2005:

An act to provide for the proper tax treatment of certain disaster mitigation payments (Pub. L. 109-7);

The Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 (Pub. L.

109-8); and The Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (Pub. L. 109-13).

The effects of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 are identified separately on the enclosed report. The effects of all other laws are included in the "previously enacted" section of the report, consistent with the budget resolution assumptions.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH M. ROBINSON
(For Douglas Holtz-Eakin, Director).

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2005 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF MAY 23, 2005
[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in previous sessions: ¹			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	1,484,024
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,191,357	1,102,621	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	1,298,963	1,369,221	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	-415,912	-415,912	n.a.
Total, enacted in previous sessions:	2,074,408	2,055,930	1,484,024
Enacted this session:			
Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (Pub. L. 109-13) ²	-1,058	4	41
Total Current Level²⁻³	2,073,350	2,055,934	1,484,065
Total Budget Resolution	2,078,456	2,056,006	1,483,658
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	407
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	5,106	72	n.a.
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2005-2009:			
House Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	8,603,391
House Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	8,519,748
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	83,643
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Notes: n.a. = not applicable; P. L. = Public Law.

¹ The effects of an act to provide for the proper tax treatment of certain disaster mitigation payments (Pub. L. 109-7) and the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 (Pub. L. 109-8) are included in this section of the table, consistent with the budget resolution assumptions.

² Pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the current level excludes \$83,140 million in budget authority and \$33,034 million in outlays from the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (Pub. L. 109-13).

³ Excludes administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2006 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2006 THROUGH FY 2010

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2006 and for the five-year period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010. This report is necessary to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act and section 401 of the conference report on the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006 (H. Con. Res. 95). This status report is current through May 23, 2005.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated

for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

The first table in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set forth by H. Con. Res. 95. This comparison is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The second table compares, by authorizing committee, the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discretionary action with the "section 302(a)" allocations made under H.

Con. Res. 95 for fiscal year 2006 and fiscal years 2006 through 2010. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2006 with the "section 302(b)" suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The

comparison is also needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) suballocation as well as the 302(a) allocation.

The fourth table gives the current level for 2007 of accounts identified for advance appropriations under section 401 of H. Con. Res. 95. This list is needed to enforce section 401 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriation bills or amendments thereto that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2006 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN HOUSE CONGRESSIONAL RESOLUTION 95

(Reflecting action completed as of May 23, 2005—On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year 2006	Fiscal years 2006—2010
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	2,144,384	(1)
Outlays	2,161,420	(1)
Revenues	1,589,892	9,080,006
Current Level:		
Budget Authority	1,320,811	(1)
Outlays	1,644,899	(1)
Revenues	1,607,661	9,185,688
Current Level over (+)/under (-) Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	-823,573	(1)
Outlays	-516,521	(1)
Revenues	17,769	105,682

¹Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2007 through 2010 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing new budget authority for FY 2006 in excess of \$823,573,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate)

would cause FY 2006 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of measures providing new outlays for FY 2006 in excess of \$516,521,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2006 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

REVENUES

Enactment of measures that would reduce revenue for FY 2006 in excess of \$17,769,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

Enactment of measures resulting in revenue reduction for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010 in excess of \$105,682,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by H. Con. Res. 95.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF MAY 23, 2005
(Fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

House committee	2006		2006–2010 total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Armed Services:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Education and the Workforce:				
Allocation	100	100	500	500
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	-100	-100	-500	-500
Energy and Commerce:				
Allocation	100	100	2,000	2,000
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	-100	-100	-2,000	-2,000
Financial Services:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Government Reform:				
Allocation	50	50	50	50
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	-50	-50	-50	-50
House Administration:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
International Relations:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Judiciary:				
Allocation	6	6	6	6
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	-6	-6	-6	-6
Resources:				
Allocation	8	8	50	50
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	-8	-8	-50	-50
Science:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Small Business:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Transportation and Infrastructure:				
Allocation	3,027	0	4,107	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	-3,027	0	-4,107	0
Veterans' Affairs:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Ways and Means:				
Allocation	350	346	1,537	1,914
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	-350	-346	-1,537	-1,914

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUBALLOCATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

Appropriations subcommittee	302(b) Suballocations as of May 18, 2005 (H. Rpt. 109-85)		Current level reflecting action completed as of May 23, 2005		Current level minus suballocations	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
	Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	16,832	18,691	7	5,399	-16,825
Defense	363,440	372,696	27	126,306	-363,413	-246,390
Energy & Water Development	29,746	30,273	36	11,092	-29,710	-19,181
Foreign Operations	20,270	25,380	0	17,091	-20,270	-8,289
Homeland Security	30,846	33,233	0	14,762	-30,846	-18,471
Interior-Environment	26,107	27,500	0	11,504	-26,107	-15,996
Labor, HHS & Education	142,514	143,802	19,166	98,279	-123,348	-45,523
Legislative Branch	3,719	3,804	0	624	-3,719	-3,180
Military Quality of Life-Veterans Affairs	85,158	81,634	-2,170	16,515	-87,328	-65,119
Science-State-Justice-Commerce	57,453	58,856	0	23,080	-57,453	-35,776
Transportation-Treasury-HUD-Judiciary-DC	66,935	120,908	4,223	70,800	-62,712	-50,108
Unassigned	0	59	0	0	0	-59
Total (Section 302(a) Allocation)	843,020	916,836	21,289	395,452	-821,731	-521,384

STATEMENT OF FY2007 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS UNDER SECTION 401 OF H. CON. RES. 95, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF MAY 23, 2005

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority
Appropriate Level	23,158
Current Level:	
Elk Hills	0
Employment and Training Administration	0
Education for the Disadvantaged	0
School Improvement	0
Children and Family Services (Head Start)	0
Special Education	0
Vocational and Adult Education	0
Payment to Postal Service	0
Section 8 Renewals	0
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	0
Total	0

STATEMENT OF FY2007 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS UNDER SECTION 401 OF H. CON. RES. 95, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF MAY 23, 2005—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority
Current Level over (+) / under (-) Appropriate Level	-23,158
U.S. CONGRESS, CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE, Washington, DC, May 26, 2005. Hon. JIM NUSSLE, Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC. DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: the enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2006 budget and is current through May 23, 2005. This report is sub-	

mitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006. Pursuant to section 402 of that resolution, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the enclosed current level report excludes these amounts (see footnote 2 of the report). This is my first report for fiscal year 2006.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH M. ROBINSON

(For DOUGLAS HOLTZ-EAKIN, Director).

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2006 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF MAY 23, 2005

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in previous sessions: ¹			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	1,607,650
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,351,021	1,318,426	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	382,272	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	-479,872	-479,872	n.a.
Total, enacted in previous sessions:	871,149	1,220,826	1,607,650
Enacted this session:			
Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (Pub. L. 109-13) ²	-39	-21	-11
Entitlements and mandatories:			
Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted	449,701	424,094	n.a.
Total Current Level^{2,3}	1,320,811	1,644,899	1,607,661
Total Budget Resolution	2,144,384	2,161,420	1,589,892
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	17,769
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	823,573	516,521	n.a.
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2006-2010:			
House Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	9,185,688
House Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	9,080,006
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	105,682
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Notes: n.a. = not applicable, P.L. = Public Law.

¹ The effects of an act to provide for the proper tax treatment of certain disaster mitigation payments (P.L. 109-7) and the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-8) are included in this section of the table, consistent with the budget resolution assumptions.

² Pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006, provision designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the current level excludes \$30,790 million in outlays from funds provided in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (P.L. 109-13).

³ Excludes administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

COLORADO TORPEDO PROGRAM REALIZES COST SAVINGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BEAUPREZ. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight to speak to my colleagues and those watching these proceedings about something that is occurring in Colorado's 7th Congressional District which is directly benefiting the Department of the Navy and the U.S. taxpayer.

I am so honored to have met the great folks in Arvada, Colorado, my home State, who work for Barber-Nichols, Incorporated, and to hear their story about what they have been able to do so far for the Navy's Surface Ship Torpedo Defense, SSTD, program.

□ 1800

This program uses a torpedo, or more particularly an anti-torpedo torpedo to protect our ships.

I know it sounds a bit off center, a landlocked State such as Colorado with such expertise in torpedo programs. In fact, Barber-Nichols possesses both ad-

vanced engineering and manufacturing prowess that are ideal for reducing the high cost of technology equipment such as the ATT, a very complicated weapon which has approximately 700 separate parts.

Barber-Nichols has used their expertise to help the Navy and the American taxpayer reduce the cost of the torpedo and provide tremendous cost savings in the program. To date, for every \$1 we have spent on the ATT affordability program, the Navy has realized future production cost savings of \$15. Barber-Nichols approached the Navy and their design agent, the Applied Research

Laboratory, or ARL, at Penn State to discuss how to consider manufacturability and assemble ability concepts in the design today so that we can save money in the production tomorrow.

As we have all witnessed, Mr. Speaker, developing and maintaining the best military in the world comes with a hefty price tag. In an extremely tight budget environment, it goes without saying that any program that can save money helps that service perform better.

With that said, let me tell you more about the ATT program and the affordability efforts that are ongoing in this program. The surface ship torpedo defense program and the anti-torpedo torpedo program were started by the United States Navy because our ships were, and remain, vulnerable to torpedo attack. Currently, there are several torpedoes available on the world market that we have little or no defense against. That is right, little to no defense against a torpedo attack.

The threat increases when we move our ships from the open ocean, where we can see for hundreds of miles, to coastal areas where threats can get closer to our ships and our reaction time is lessened. As we project our forces into the Third World areas, we operate in locations like the Persian Gulf where we are much more vulnerable.

Torpedoes can be bought on the black market by people and organizations who wish to do us harm. These torpedoes can be launched from the shoreline or small boats, threats that we were not too worried about until the USS *Cole* incident where 17 U.S. sailors made the ultimate sacrifice.

Because of this threat to our ships and sailors, Congress has weighed in heavily in support of torpedo defense, as was stated in a letter to the Secretary of the Navy back in 1997, signed by Chairman DUNCAN HUNTER and other Members of this House, including ROSCOE BARTLETT, who is with us tonight, Bob Dornan, DUKE CUNNINGHAM and GENE TAYLOR. I quote from their letter:

“We are especially concerned that our high-value ships that carry hundreds or even thousands of our young sailors and marines are very vulnerable to particular classes of torpedoes.”

Congress has also asked the Navy to study the vulnerability of our ships as evidenced in this quote:

“We therefore ask you to conduct an independent review of the SSTD program and provide us with your findings.” That in a letter to the Under Secretary of the Navy, again from Congressman HUNTER, BARTLETT, Dornan and CUNNINGHAM.

And Congress has agreed with the independent studies that say we should move forward with torpedo defense as seen in this quote:

“I understand that the IDA study is completed and that the results strongly confirm that all ships need to be

protected from torpedoes. I look forward to working with you to improve the capability of our ships to defend themselves against torpedo attack.” That, in a letter to the Secretary of Defense from Chairman DUNCAN HUNTER.

Congress since has provided multiple years of funding to allow the Navy to address the issue. The Navy agrees our sailors and high-value ships are worth protecting and that torpedo defense is an important capability to have.

Thus, the Navy has, first, teamed with our ally, Great Britain, to jointly develop elements of a surface ship torpedo defense system; secondly, made torpedo defense a requirement for new ship design efforts; third, identified the anti-torpedo torpedo as the solution for torpedo defense; and fourth, developed an anti-torpedo torpedo technology demonstrator that has included successful in-water testing.

In the FY 2006 budget, the Navy requested over \$47 million for torpedo defense, so Congress is well aware of their interest in continuing this program into the future.

Mr. Speaker, I have talked a lot about the need and the desire to protect our ships and our sailors. I bet you would like to hear about how the Navy envisions the system will work. This chart to my left depicts the AN/WSQ-11, this surface ship torpedo defense system. In very simple terms, surface ship torpedo defense is accomplished by detecting a threat torpedo with a sensor towed behind the ship, launching the anti-torpedo torpedo against that threat, intercepting the threat torpedo with the ATT, and destroying it, obviously, before the threat can reach our ship.

Conceptually, it looks fairly simple. Practically, intercepting a torpedo under water is quite difficult. We have all seen the challenges played out in the newspapers regarding missile defense. This is essentially the same thing under water, albeit at far slower speeds. The good news is that the tests, to date, show that the technology works.

Mr. Speaker, we started this discussion tonight with an acknowledgment regarding the hefty price tag associated with developing and maintaining the best military in the world. However, as stewards of the public's money in this Chamber, we should be looking for ways to spend it wisely. The ATT affordability program is a prime example of fiscal responsibility in military spending.

The anti-torpedo torpedo affordability program was started to ensure we could afford the surface ship torpedo defense system when it goes to production. The ATT affordability program is very similar to the efforts commercial companies across our Nation practice on a daily basis.

Commercial product companies develop a new product with a final cost in mind. They eliminate features that are not cost effective, and they continually

look for ways to reduce cost during that product design. Once the product is designed and developed, they work hard to manufacture the product in a cost-effective manner.

The important fact to realize is that 80 percent of the product cost is predetermined in the design process, not in the manufacturing process. Thus, addressing affordability must be done in that first design process.

In the ATT affordability program, my constituent Barber-Nichols, a commercial company again in Arvada, Colorado, is working with the Navy's design agent, ARL-Penn State, to simplify the product, reduce costs of manufacture and assembly and ensure affordability and cost reduction are considered in the design process.

Affordability is usually not addressed in government technology development programs until after a production program is awarded. Contractors can reduce cost with innovative manufacturing approaches, but the bulk of the potential cost savings will not ever be realized because they were not addressed in the product design. Incorporating commercial best practices like we have just discussed into government procurement practices could save us potentially a great deal of taxpayer money.

One aspect of affordability is design for manufacturability. In a simplistic way, this chart to my left depicts the major steps in the process. The way this is accomplished is that you first start with a baseline design, understand what each part of it costs to make, then look at the high-priced pieces to see if costs can be reduced. You then develop lower-cost alternative designs that are constructed and tested. If these alternative designs are successful, both technically and costwise, you can incorporate the alternative design into the baseline design.

This design for manufacturability method has been used on the anti-torpedo torpedo. First, a baseline design cost study was performed. From this study, the most expensive parts of the torpedo were found and it was determined that the engine was the most expensive subsystem of the product, as depicted in this new graph. This cost analysis helped in understanding what to focus on first. Where is the biggest bang for the buck? From this analysis, the development moved into affordability projects.

One example of a high-priced component that was made into an ATT affordability project is the torpedo propulsor shown on this next chart. That is this machined part from the ATT depicted here. In the production quantities planned, the part was estimated to cost about \$14,000 each. I have seen this part. It fits easily into the palm of my hand. Again, it was estimated initially to cost about \$14,000 each.

The DFM process yielded a lower-cost design that was much easier to

make. This low-cost design was manufactured and tested. The tests showed it performed as well as the expensive design. Thus, this low-cost design will now be incorporated into the government's baseline design. When this part goes into production, it will now cost a little over \$2,000 each instead of the \$14,000, resulting in production program savings of about 80 percent of the original cost estimate.

Another example of an affordability project under way is the electronic card carrier set, one of which is shown here. The current design is a set of fully machined metal pieces that would cost approximately \$4,000 a set if manufactured in production today as originally designed.

The low-cost alternative design uses die cast pieces with very little machining. If these are successfully fabricated and tested later this year, the Navy will achieve a very substantial cost savings with this part as well. The low-cost design is expected to cost approximately \$200 per set and result is a cost savings of almost that full \$4,000 of the original estimated cost, or about 95 percent.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the ATT affordability program has been extremely successful and must stay the programmatic course in order to protect our sailors and ships when they are in harm's way. The projects completed in 2003 and 2004 are expected to save \$31.2 million of taxpayer money when the ATT goes into production. More projects are planned in 2005 through 2007. We estimate the government will save \$15 in production costs for every \$1 spent in this affordability effort.

Developing and maintaining the best military in the world comes with a price. In an extremely tight budget environment, any program that can save money should be applauded and supported.

I congratulate Barber-Nichols, Inc., of Arvada, Colorado; ARL-Penn State, and certainly the Navy for their efforts with the ATT program and hope other such collaborative design projects will provide for our security, protect our troops and use taxpayer dollars as prudently as possible.

APPOINTMENT OF HON. MAC THORNBERRY OR HON. WAYNE T. GILCHREST TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH JUNE 7, 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLE of New York) laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
Washington, DC, May 26, 2005.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MAC THORNBERRY or, if he is not available to perform this duty, the Honorable WAYNE T. GILCHREST to act as Speaker pro tempore to

sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through June 7, 2005.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointment is approved.

There was no objection.

□ 1815

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 3, TRANSPORTATION EQUITY ACT: A LEGACY FOR USERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLE of New York). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of the House bill (except title X) and the Senate amendment (except title V), and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. YOUNG of Alaska, PETRI, BOEHLERT, COBLE, DUNCAN, MICA, HOEKSTRA, LATOURETTE, BACHUS, BAKER, GARY G. MILLER of California, HAYES, SIMMONS, BROWN of South Carolina, GRAVES, SHUSTER, BOOZMAN, OBERSTAR, RAHALL, DEFAZIO, COSTELLO, Ms. NORTON, Messrs. NADLER, MENENDEZ, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. FILNER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.

From the Committee on the Budget, for consideration of sections 8001-8003 of the House bill, and title III of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. NUSSLE, MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Spratt.

From the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for consideration of sections 1118, 1605, 1809, 3018, and 3030 of the House bill, and sections 1304, 1819, 6013, 6031, 6038, and 7603 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. KLINE, KELLER, and BARROW.

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of provisions in the House bill and Senate amendment relating to Clean Air Act provisions of transportation planning contained in sections 6001 and 6006 of the House bill; and sections 6005 and 6006 of the Senate amendment; and sections 1210, 1824, 1833, 5203, and 6008 of the House bill; and sections 1501, 1511, 1522, 1610-1619, 1622, 4001, 4002, 6016, 6023, 7218, 7223, 7251, 7252, 7256-7262, 7324, 7381, 7382, and 7384 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BARTON of Texas, PICKERING, and DINGELL.

From the Committee on Government Reform, for consideration of section 4205 of the House bill, and section 2101 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, PLATTS, and WAXMAN.

From the Committee on Homeland Security, for consideration of sections 1834, 6027, 7324, and 7325 of the Senate

amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. COX, DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and THOMPSON of Mississippi.

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of sections 1211, 1605, 1812, 1832, 2013, 2017, 4105, 4201, 4202, 4214, 7018-7020, and 7023 of the House bill, and sections 1410, 1512, 1513, 6006, 6029, 7108, 7113, 7115, 7338, 7340, 7343, 7345, 7362, 7363, 7406, 7407, and 7413 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. SENBRENNER, SMITH of Texas, and CONYERS.

From the Committee on Resources, for consideration of sections 1119, 3021, 6002, and 6003 of the House bill, and sections 1501, 1502, 1505, 1511, 1514, 1601, 1603, 6040, and 7501-7518 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. POMBO, WALDEN of Oregon, and KIND.

From the Committee on Rules, for consideration of sections 8004 and 8005 of the House bill, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. DREIER, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

From the Committee on Science, for consideration of sections 2010, 3013, 3015, 3034, 3039, 3041, 4112, and title V of the House bill, and title II and sections 6014, 6015, 6036, 7118, 7212, 7214, 7361, and 7370 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. EHLERS, REICHERT, and GORDON.

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of title X of the House bill, and title V of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. THOMAS, MCCRERY, and RANGEL.

For consideration of the House bill and Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. DELAY.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DOYLE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of a family emergency.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 3:00 p.m. on account of business in the district.

Mr. MENENDEZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WU, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAYWORTH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HAYWORTH, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NUSSLE, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

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

H.R. 2566. An act to provide an extension of highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a law reauthorizing the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the previous order of the House today, the House stands adjourned until noon on Monday, May 30, 2005, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 167, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

Thereupon, (at 6 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), pursuant to the previous order of the House of today, the House adjourned until noon on Monday, May 30, 2005, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 167, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2183. A letter from the Acting Assistant Deputy Secretary, Office of Innovation and Improvement, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Notice of Final Selection Criteria and Other Application Requirements—Teaching American History—received April 25, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2184. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Comprehensive School Reform Quality Initiative—received May 5, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2185. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2186. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2187. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2188. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2189. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2190. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2191. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2192. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2193. A letter from the Director, Office of White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2194. A letter from the Director, Office of White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2195. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2196. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2197. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2198. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2199. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2200. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2201. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2202. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2203. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2204. A letter from the Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy, transmitting a report on the "Fiscal Year 2004 Accounting of Drug Control Funds," pursuant to Public Law 105-277, section 705(d)(Div. C—Title VII); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2205. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Regulations; Areas of the National Park System (RIN: 1024-AD29) received April 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2206. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Apostle Islands National Lakeshore; Designation of snowmobile and off-road motor vehicle areas, and use of portable ice augers or power engines. (RIN: 1024-AD26) received April 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2207. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—National Park System Units in Alaska (RIN: 1024-AD13) received April 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2208. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Illinois Regulatory Program [Docket No. IL-104-FOR] received May 16, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2209. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Iowa Regulatory Program [Docket No. IA-014-FOR] received April 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2210. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Mineral Mgmt., Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Land Use Planning [WO-350-2520-24 1A] (RIN: 1004-AD57) received March 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2211. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFIS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Recordkeeping and Reporting Requirements; Regulatory Amendment to Modify Seafood Dealer Reporting Requirements [Docket No. 505216041-5105-02; I.D. 020705C] (RIN: 0648-AS87) received May 13, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2212. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Br., Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's

final rule—Residence and Source Rules Involving U.S. Possessions and Other Conforming Changes [TD 9194] (RIN: 1545-BE22) received April 11, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2213. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Br., Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Diesel fuel and kerosene excise tax; dye injection [TD 9199] (RIN: 1545-BE44) received April 29, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2214. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Br., Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Appeals Settlement Guidelines: Maquiladora—Section 168(g)—received April 11, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2215. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Br., Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Coordinated Issue: "Notice 2002-65" Tax Shelter—received May 11, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2216. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Br., Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Coordinated Issue: "Notice 2002-50" Tax Shelter—received May 11, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2217. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Br., Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Nonconventional Source Fuel Credit, Section 29 Inflation Adjustment Factor, and Section 29 Reference Price [Notice 2005-33] received April 29, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2218. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Br., Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Rulings and determination letters. (Rev. Proc. 2005-25) received April 11, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2219. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Br., Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Weighted Average Interest Rates Update [Notice 2005-34] received April 11, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2220. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Br., Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Election for Multiemployer Plan to Defer Net Experience Loss Charge [Notice 2005-40] received May 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2221. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Br., Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Guidance Under Section 355(e); Recognition of Gain on Certain Distributions of Stock or Securities in Connection with and Acquisition [TD 9198] (RIN: 1545-AY42) received April 20, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2222. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Br., Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Determination of Issue Price in the Case of Certain Debt Instruments Issued for Property (Rev. Rul. 2005-27) received April 20, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1496. A bill to return general aviation to Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport; with an amendment (Rept. 109-98). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2293. A bill to provide special immigrant status for aliens serving as translators with the United States Armed Forces; with an amendment (Rept. 109-99). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 27. Resolution withdrawing the approval of the United States from the Agreement establishing the World Trade Organization; adversely; (Rept. 109-100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HENSARLING (for himself and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 2646. A bill to eliminate certain restrictions on air transportation to and from Love Field, Texas; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NUSSLE:

H.R. 2647. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that qualified personal service corporations may continue to use the cash method of accounting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSSELLA (for himself, Mr. STEARNS, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. NEY, Mr. GOODE, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 2648. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require Medicaid drug utilization review programs to deny coverage of erectile dysfunction drugs for individuals registered (or required to be registered) as sex offenders; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 2649. A bill to strengthen aviation security; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NORWOOD:

H.R. 2650. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to protect consumers in managed care plans and other health coverage; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself and Mr. COBLE):

H.R. 2651. A bill to reduce crime and terrorism at America's seaports, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of Oklahoma:

H.R. 2652. A bill to provide for the establishment of a memorial to the U.S.S. Oklahoma as part of the USS Arizona Memorial in Pearl Harbor, Hawaii; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2653. A bill to ensure that dwelling units assisted under the rental housing voucher program under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 comply with housing quality standards; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2654. A bill to provide for renewal of project-based assisted housing contracts at reimbursement levels that are sufficient to sustain operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2655. A bill to establish neighborhood review committees to advise public housing agencies regarding the enforcement of laws and regulations governing assistance provided under tenant-based rental assistance programs; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2656. A bill to amend section 502(h) of the Housing Act of 1949 to improve the rural housing loan guarantee program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER):

H.R. 2657. A bill to provide comprehensive reform regarding medical malpractice; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 2658. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify the jurisdiction of the Federal Government over waters of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BOSWELL:

H.R. 2659. A bill to provide grants to States to improve sex offender registries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OXLEY (for himself and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 2660. A bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 to clarify that real estate brokerage activities and real estate management activities are authorized financial activities for financial holding companies and financial subsidiaries of national banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 2661. A bill to amend the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984 to clarify the Permanent University Fund arbitrage exception and to increase from 20 percent to 30 percent the amount of securities and obligations benefiting from the exception; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. DELAHUNT,

Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HOYER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIND, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEACH, Ms. LEE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. NADLER, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SABO, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. STARK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 2662. A bill to provide Federal assistance to States and local jurisdictions to prosecute hate crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SIMMONS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 2663. A bill to provide a grant program to support the establishment and operation of Teachers Professional Development Institutes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DREIER (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. REGULA, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BASS, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 2664. A bill to provide a biennial budget for the United States Government; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 2665. A bill to encourage the availability and use of motor vehicles that have improved fuel efficiency, in order to reduce the need to import oil into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2666. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the determination and deduction of interest on qualified education loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania (for himself, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. SIMMONS, and Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2667. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to prepare a report on the homeland security consequences of the

base closure and realignment recommendations made by the Secretary of Defense and to require the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission to consider the report during their review of such recommendations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. PAUL):

H.R. 2668. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the creation of disaster protection funds by property and casualty insurance companies for the payment of policyholders' claims arising from future catastrophic events; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 2669. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to strengthen the ability of the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the pet industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 2670. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require the amounts reimbursed to institutional providers of health care services under the TRICARE program to be the same as amounts reimbursed under Medicare, and to require the Secretary of Defense to contract for health care services with at least one teaching hospital in urban areas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 2671. A bill to provide for the expansion of Federal programs to prevent and manage vision loss, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 2672. A bill to direct the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a program to enhance the mutual security and safety of the United States, Canada, and Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HEFLEY (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota):

H.R. 2673. A bill to protect diverse and structurally complex areas of the seafloor in the United States exclusive economic zone by establishing a maximum diameter size limit on rockhopper, roller, and all other groundgear used on bottom trawls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HOLDEN (for himself and Mr. POMEROY):

H.R. 2674. A bill to waive time limitations specified by law in order to allow the Medal of Honor to be awarded posthumously to Richard L. Etchberger of Hamburg, Pennsylvania, for acts of valor on March 11, 1968, while an Air Force Chief Master Sergeant serving in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam era; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 2675. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on TMC114; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 2676. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain chemicals and chemical mixtures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 2677. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 2678. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on mixtures of (1A1B1A)-(cis and trans)-1-(2-(2,4-Dichlorophenyl)-4-propyl-1,3-dioxalan-2-yl)methyl)-1H-1,2,4-triazole (Propiconazole) and application adjuvants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSTETTLER (for himself, Mr.

WAMP, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. SODREL, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. OTTER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. POE, and Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina):

H.R. 2679. A bill to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States to eliminate the chilling effect on the constitutionally protected expression of religion by State and local officials that results from the threat that potential litigants may seek damages and attorney's fees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULSHOF (for himself, Mr.

POMEROY, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. SHAW):

H.R. 2680. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit a waiver by the Secretary of Health and Human Services of the 24-month waiting period for Medicare coverage of disabled individuals who are terminally ill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JEFFERSON (for himself, Mr.

ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut,

Mr. CARDIN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr.

MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia,

Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr.

LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. ABER-

CROMBIE, Ms. CARSON, Mrs.

CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAV-

ER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr.

CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama,

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FATTAH,

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr.

GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr.

HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA,

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE

BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KIL-

PATRICK of Michigan, Mrs. MALONEY,

Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MENEN-

DEZ, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr.

MILLER of North Carolina, Mr.

GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr.

MOORE of Kansas, Ms. MOORE of Wis-

consin, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr.

PAYNE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina,

Mr. ROSS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of

Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of Cali-

ifornia, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of Cali-

ifornia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. THOMPSON

of Mississippi, Ms. WASSERMAN

SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON,

Mr. WYNN, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 2681. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to rename the low-income housing credit the affordable housing credit and to increase the per capita amount allowed in the determination of the State housing credit ceiling; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr.

MICHAUD, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 2682. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a deduction for qualified long-term care insurance premiums, use of such insurance under cafeteria plans and flexible spending arrangements, and a credit for individuals with long-term care needs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. JONES of Ohio (for herself, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. OWENS, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. CARSON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

H.R. 2683. A bill to increase the expertise and capacity of community-based organizations involved in economic development activities and key community development programs; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. KELLY (for herself and Mrs. TAUSCHER):

H.R. 2684. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 2685. A bill to provide for prescription drugs at reduced prices to Medicare beneficiaries; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LOBIONDO (for himself, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. SAXTON):

H.R. 2686. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for grants for coastal recreation water quality monitoring and notification programs; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California (for herself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HONDA, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FARR, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE):

H.R. 2687. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the automatic acquisition of citizenship by certain Amerasians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. McNULTY):

H.R. 2688. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to establish a deadline for the screening of all individuals, goods, property, vehicles, and other equipment entering a secure area of an airport, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 2689. A bill to increase the security of radiation sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MCKINNEY:

H.R. 2690. A bill to provide that a State may use a proportional voting system for multiseat congressional districts, to require the use of instant runoff voting in certain elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MELANCON:

H.R. 2691. A bill to amend the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002 to require the President to submit to the Congress, within 90 days after entering into a trade agreement, the implementing legislation, the statement of administrative action, and supporting information, with respect to that trade agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 2692. A bill to extend the Acadia National Park Advisory Commission, to provide improved visitor services at the park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself and Mr. BAIRD):

H.R. 2693. A bill to amend the Great Ape Conservation Act to reauthorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide project grants and emergency assistance to address critical great ape conservation needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MOORE of Kansas (for himself, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. TANNER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. WEINER, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. NADLER, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CASE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. FORD, Mr. MICHAUD, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 2694. A bill to require full funding of part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin (for herself and Ms. HARRIS):

H.R. 2695. A bill to amend the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to protect the personally identifying information of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2696. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 9,10-Anthracenedione, 1,8-dihydroxy-4-nitro-5-(phenylamino)-; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2697. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Chromate(2-), [2,4-dihydro-4-[[2-(hydroxy-kO)-4-nitrophenyl]azo-kN1]-5-methyl-3H-pyrazol-3-onato(2-)-kO3]]-[4,5-dihydro-3-methyl-1-(4-methylphenyl)-5-(oxo-kO)-1H-pyrazol-4-yl]azo-kN1]-4-(hydroxy-kO)-5-nitrobenzenesulfonato(3-)-, disodium; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2698. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 9,10-Anthracenedione, 1,8-bis(phenylthio)-; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2699. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2,7-Naphthalenedisulfonic acid, 4-amino-3,6-bis[[5-[[4-chloro-6-[methyl(2-methylamino)-2-oxoethyl]amino]-1,3,5-triazin-2-yl]amino]-2-sulfophenyl]azo]-5-hydroxy-

lithium potassium sodium salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2700. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2-Naphthalenesulfonic acid, 7-[[5-chloro-2,6-difluoro-4-pyrimidinyl]amino]-4-hydroxy-3-[[4-methoxy-2-sulfophenyl]azo]-, sodium salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2701. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2,7-Naphthalenedisulfonic acid, 4-amino-5-hydroxy-6-[[2-methoxy-5-[[2-(sulfoxy)ethyl]sulfonyl]phenyl]azo]-3-[[4-[[2-(sulfoxy)ethyl]sulfonyl]phenyl]azo]-, tetrasodium salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2702. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2,7-Naphthalenedisulfonic acid, 4-amino-5-hydroxy-3,6-bis[[4-[[2-(sulfoxy)ethyl]sulfonyl]phenyl]azo]-, tetrasodium salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2703. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on [2,2'-Bi-1H-indole]-3,3'-diol-, potassium sodium salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2704. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 3-Pyridinecarboxitrile, 5-[[2-(cyano-4-nitrophenyl)azo]-2-[[2-(2-hydroxyethoxy)ethyl]amino]-4-methyl-6-(phenylamino)-; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2705. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Acetic acid, cyano[3-[[6-methoxy-2-benzothiazolyl]amino]-1H-indol-1-ylidene]-, pentyl ester; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2706. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Benzenesulfonic acid, [(9,10-dihydro-9,10-dioxo-1,4-anthracenediyl)bis[imino[3-(2-methylpropyl)-3,1-propanediyl]]]bis-, disodium salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2707. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Acetic acid, [4-(2,6-dihydro-2,6-dioxo-7-phenylbenzo[1,2-b:4,5-b']difuran-3-yl)phenoxy]-, 2-ethoxyethyl ester; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2708. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Benzo[1,2-b:4,5-b']difuran-2,6-dione, 3-phenyl-7-(4-propoxyphenyl)-; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2709. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Ethanesulfonic acid, 2-[[2,5-dichloro-4-[[2-methyl-1H-indol-3-yl]azo]phenyl]sulfonyl]amino]-, monosodium salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2710. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2,7-Naphthalenedisulfonic acid, 5-[[4-chloro-6-[[3-sulfophenyl]amino]-1,3,5-triazin-2-yl]amino]-4-hydroxy-3-[[4-[[2-(sulfoxy)ethyl]sulfonyl]phenyl]azo]-, sodium salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2711. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 1,3,6-Naphthalenetrisulfonic acid, 7-[[2-[(aminocarbonyl)amino]-4-[[4-[[2-[[3-[(aminocarbonyl)amino]-4-[[3,6,8-trisulfo-2-naphthalenyl]azo]phenyl]amino]-6-chloro-1,3,5-triazin-2-yl]amino]ethyl]-1-piperazinyl]-chloro-1,3,5-triazin-2-yl]amino]phenyl]azo]-, lithium potassium sodium salt)-; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2712. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 9,10-Anthracenedione, 1,8-dihydroxy-4-nitro-5-(phenylamino)-; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2713. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2-Anthracenesulfonic acid, 4-[[3-(acetylamino)phenyl]amino]-1-amino-9,10-dihydro-9,10-dioxo-, monosodium salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2714. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Acetic acid, [4-[2,6-dihydro-2,6-dioxo-7-(4-propoxyphenyl)benzo[1,2-b:4,5-b']difuran-3-yl]phenoxy]-, 2-ethoxyethyl ester; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself and Mr. FLAKE):

H.R. 2715. A bill to establish reasonable procedural protections for the use of national security letters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OLVER (for himself, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 2716. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to improve access to advanced practice nurses and physician assistants under the Medicaid Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OSBORNE (for himself and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2717. A bill to reduce hunger in the United States by half by 2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OTTER:

H.R. 2718. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain Federal land within the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. OLVER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FARR, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DEFazio, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. LEE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CASE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HONDA, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. STARK, Mr. GILCHREST, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina):

H.R. 2719. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify that fill material cannot be comprised of waste; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PEARCE (for himself, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mrs. CUBIN):

H.R. 2720. A bill to further the purposes of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 by directing the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation, to carry out an assessment and demonstration program

to control salt cedar and Russian olive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Ms. HART, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. REGULA, Mr. WAMP, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FORD, Mr. GORDON, and Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2721. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to reauthorize collection of reclamation fees, revise the abandoned mine reclamation program, promote re-mining, authorize the Office of Surface Mining to collect the black lung excise tax, and make sundry other changes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. PLATTS (for himself, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. SHERWOOD):

H.R. 2722. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating Camp Security, located in Springettsbury, York County, Pennsylvania, as a unit of the National Park System; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 2723. A bill to provide for the common defense by requiring that all young persons in the United States, including women, perform a period of military service or a period of civilian service in furtherance of the national defense and homeland security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 2724. A bill to establish a national Civilian Volunteer Service Reserve program, a national volunteer service corps ready for service in response to domestic or international emergencies; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. REGULA (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HYDE, Mr. HALL, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BAKER, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. JINDAL, and Mr. MELANCON):

H.R. 2725. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to make a grant to the National D-Day Museum Foundation for facilities and programs of America's National World War II Museum; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 2726. A bill to prohibit municipal governments from offering telecommunications, information, or cable services except to remedy market failures by private enterprise to provide such services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2727. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for educational activities and research with respect to women's pelvic floor health through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHADEGG:

H.R. 2728. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to expand health care access and choice of coverage through Individual Membership Associations (IMAs); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHADEGG:

H.R. 2729. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect certain health

care providers against legal liability for providing emergency and related care to uninsured individuals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHADEGG (for himself, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. RENZI, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CANNON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. WAXMAN, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2730. A bill to establish a grant program to fund eligible joint ventures between United States and Israeli businesses and academic persons, to establish the International Energy Advisory Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHADEGG:

H.R. 2731. A bill to limit the liability of hospitals and emergency departments for noneconomic and punitive damages when providing uncompensated care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHADEGG:

H.R. 2732. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a refundable and advanceable credit against income tax for health insurance costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 2733. A bill to prohibit the closure or adverse realignment of facilities of the reserve components that the Secretary of Homeland Security determines have a significant role in homeland defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2734. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to enhance the authority of the Department of Veterans Affairs to recover from third parties costs of medical care furnished to veterans and other persons by the Department; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MURPHY):

H.R. 2735. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide an enhanced funding process to ensure an adequate level of funding for veterans health care programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to establish standards of access to care for veterans seeking health care from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. LEACH, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 2736. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit direct payment under the Medicare Program for clinical social worker services provided to residents of skilled nursing facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STRICKLAND (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2737. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish an Office of Correctional Public Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 2738. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 to provide that a current connection is not lost by an individual

who is misled or not properly informed by the Railroad Retirement Board of the requirement for, and the circumstances resulting in the loss of, a current connection; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TIERNEY (for himself, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. WU, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. REYES, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CASE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CARDOZA, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. BARROW, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2739. A bill to address rising college tuition by strengthening the compact between the States, the Federal Government, and institutions of higher education to make college more affordable; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WYNN:

H.R. 2740. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require the provision of a written prompt payment policy to each subcontractor under a Federal contract and to require a clause in each subcontract under a Federal contract that outlines the provisions of the prompt payment statute and other related information; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. WYNN:

H.R. 2741. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide a penalty for the failure by a Federal contractor to subcontract with small businesses as described in its subcontracting plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. WYNN:

H.R. 2742. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to increase the minimum Government-wide goal for procurement contracts awarded to small business concerns; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Mr.

THOMAS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WELLER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. POE, Ms. LEE, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. WATSON, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. STARK):

H.J. Res. 52. A joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

H. Con. Res. 167. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HYDE (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H. Con. Res. 168. Concurrent resolution condemning the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for the abductions and continued captivity of citizens of the Republic of Korea and Japan as acts of terrorism and gross violations of human rights; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself and Mr. JONES of North Carolina):

H. Con. Res. 169. Concurrent resolution recognizing the families of the members of the Armed Forces for their contributions and sacrifices to the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EVANS:

H. Con. Res. 170. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Purple Heart Recognition Day; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H. Con. Res. 171. Concurrent resolution commending individuals that have participated in volunteer programs that repair the homes of families of deployed members of the Armed Forces, and in particular those of the National Guard and Reserves; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota (for

herself, Mr. LEACH, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. CARSON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. OLVER, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. KIND, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. LEE, Mr. SABO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CASE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FARR, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. PAYNE):

H. Con. Res. 172. Concurrent resolution affirming the commitment and leadership of the United States to improve the lives of the world's 1.3 billion people living in extreme poverty and conditions of misery; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Ms.

PRYCE of Ohio, Ms. HART, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CASE, Mr. KIND, Mr. WYNN, Mr. SKELTON, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. CHANDLER, Ms. CARSON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. TANNER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. CORINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PORTER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. KING of New York):

H. Con. Res. 173. Concurrent resolution expressing support for the goals of Veterans Educate Today's Students (VETS) Day, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H. Res. 299. A resolution expressing the sense of the House that the President should take immediate action to initiate measures

to lower the burden of gasoline prices on the economy of the United States, prevent Members of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries from reaping windfall profits on sales of oil to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on International Relations, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina):

H. Res. 300. A resolution recognizing the South Carolina Farm Bureau Mutual Insurance Company on the occasion of its 50th anniversary and saluting the outstanding service of the Company to the people of South Carolina; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. ANDREWS):

H. Res. 301. A resolution recognizing career and volunteer Emergency Medical Technicians and Paramedics for their bravery and critically important life-saving responsibilities in responding to crises and safeguarding the public; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POMBO (for himself, Mr. PICK-

ERING, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. ISSA, Mr. CASE, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. TANNER, Mr. KIND, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

H. Res. 302. A resolution recognizing and commending the continuing dedication and commitment of employers of the members of the National Guard and the other reserve components who have been mobilized during the Global War on Terrorism and in defense of the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. CUELLAR introduced a bill (H.R. 2743) for the relief of Aida Abigail Trevino de Zamarron; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 11: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. REYES, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

- H.R. 22: Mr. DELAHUNT.
H.R. 36: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 66: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.
H.R. 111: Mr. CARNAHAN and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
H.R. 115: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
H.R. 128: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 131: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 192: Mr. BACA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 195: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 215: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 224: Mr. INSLER.
H.R. 226: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 277: Mrs. MCCARTHY.
H.R. 282: Mr. MANZULLO and Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 292: Mr. SHADEGG.
H.R. 302: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. MATSUI, and Mrs. MCCARTHY.
H.R. 303: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 305: Mr. TANCREDO and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 328: Mr. MURTHA and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.
H.R. 376: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 414: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 415: Mr. TOWNS, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.
H.R. 420: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. PUTNAM.
H.R. 421: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 463: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 469: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 500: Mr. HEFLEY.
H.R. 503: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mrs. TAUSCHER.
H.R. 550: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
H.R. 557: Mr. LEWIS of California.
H.R. 558: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 581: Ms. GRANGER, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. POE.
H.R. 583: Mr. MURPHY.
H.R. 586: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 653: Mr. BOREN and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 676: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 697: Mr. HOLT, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 710: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 786: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 791: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 799: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 809: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SODREL, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.
H.R. 817: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. KELLER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WEINER, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 818: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 819: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 839: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 865: Mr. JONES of North Carolina and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 869: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 893: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 910: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KIND, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HOLT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. MCNULTY.
H.R. 913: Ms. HARMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. PUTNAM.
H.R. 916: Mr. CLAY and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 920: Mr. DICKS.
H.R. 994: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. SODREL, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BERRY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 997: Mr. GILCHREST and Mr. PUTNAM.
H.R. 1000: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. McHUGH.
H.R. 1010: Mr. WELLER.
H.R. 1063: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 1071: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 1126: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1131: Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 1133: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1156: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 1175: Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 1177: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 1208: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. SKELTON.
H.R. 1227: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 1233: Mr. LANTOS and Mr. Price of North Carolina.
H.R. 1241: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 1243: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. KELLER.
H.R. 1246: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1262: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1305: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 1306: Mr. NUSSLE.
H.R. 1312: Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 1316: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 1333: Mr. WELLER, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. BARROW.
H.R. 1335: Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Mr. PAS-TOR.
H.R. 1357: Mr. MURPHY.
H.R. 1358: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1360: Mr. SIMMONS and Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan.
H.R. 1374: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 1376: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.
H.R. 1424: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1426: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1431: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 1451: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 1456: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. ETHERIDGE.
H.R. 1468: Mr. MCCRERY and Mr. BECERRA.
H.R. 1492: Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 1498: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H.R. 1508: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 1510: Mr. WELLER and Mr. PUTNAM.
H.R. 1548: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1549: Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HYDE, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. BACA, Mr. NUNES, Mr. COSTA, Mr. MACK, Mr. PAUL, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. NUSSLE, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. BONO, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 1554: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 1582: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 1588: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 1591: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. BOEHLERT.
H.R. 1600: Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 1602: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 1608: Mr. CHOCOLA.
H.R. 1632: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 1634: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. DENT, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
H.R. 1642: Mr. CARDOZA.
H.R. 1649: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 1663: Mr. COSTA and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 1671: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 1682: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
H.R. 1689: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. PUTNAM, and Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 1696: Mr. REYES and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 1707: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 1709: Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. DICKS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. STARK, Mr. SABO, Ms. WATSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 1736: Mr. HOLT, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, and Ms. HARMAN.
H.R. 1745: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
H.R. 1748: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 1749: Mr. ROSS, Mr. COSTA, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 1790: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 1791: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.
H.R. 1804: Mr. SHAW, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. NEY.
H.R. 1835: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1849: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BOYD, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.
H.R. 1851: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 1862: Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 1898: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 1946: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 1956: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.
H.R. 1957: Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. HARRIS, and Ms. FOX.
H.R. 1996: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 2045: Mr. WALSH.
H.R. 2048: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 2061: Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 2063: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 2068: Mr. FRANK CHOCOLA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TANNER, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. BEAUPREZ.
H.R. 2073: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 2076: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2103: Mr. OWENS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 2106: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. HOSTETTLER.
H.R. 2121: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2122: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 2131: Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. CARSON, Mr. FATTAH, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.R. 2177: Mr. MURPHY.
H.R. 2196: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 2202: Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, and Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 2217: Mrs. MCCARTHY.
H.R. 2230: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2231: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. FORD, Mr. KIRK, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 2238: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
H.R. 2251: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 2259: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 2306: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
 H.R. 2317: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. BACA.
 H.R. 2327: Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. WATSON, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. PAUL, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. INSLEE.
 H.R. 2328: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 2330: Mr. WALSH and Mr. CROWLEY.
 H.R. 2335: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. JEFFERSON.
 H.R. 2349: Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 2350: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
 H.R. 2354: Mr. DUNCAN.
 H.R. 2356: Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 2357: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. KUHL of New York.
 H.R. 2359: Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 2363: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 2386: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. BACHUS.
 H.R. 2387: Mr. GORDON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, and Mr. BACHUS.
 H.R. 2389: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. LINDER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. MCCREY, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WELLER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KINGSTON, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. REGULA, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. TURNER, Mr. WAMP, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. MARCHANT.
 H.R. 2412: Mr. GONZALEZ.
 H.R. 2418: Mr. PICKERING, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. KIRK, Mr. WELLER, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 2420: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MALONEY, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
 H.R. 2423: Mr. REICHERT.
 H.R. 2427: Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. OBERSTAR.
 H.R. 2458: Mr. BURGESS.
 H.R. 2471: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. BOREN, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.
 H.R. 2472: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 2474: Ms. HARRIS.
 H.R. 2498: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. SKELTON.
 H.R. 2513: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. GOODE.
 H.R. 2525: Mr. GORDON.
 H.R. 2526: Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. WELLER, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 2533: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. KIND, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 2553: Mrs. MCCARTHY.
 H.R. 2561: Mr. KLINE.
 H.R. 2574: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H.R. 2592: Mr. RUSH and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
 H.R. 2600: Mr. OWENS and Mr. KUHL of New York.
 H.R. 2631: Mr. SANDERS.
 H.R. 2636: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mrs. MALONEY.
 H.R. 2641: Mr. HIGGINS.
 H.J. Res. 10: Mr. OSBORNE and Mr. HERGER.
 H.J. Res. 22: Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H. Con. Res. 108: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H. Con. Res. 148: Ms. FOXX, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H. Con. Res. 154: Mr. TANCREDO and Mrs. KELLY.

H. Con. Res. 160: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Ms. BORDALLO.

H. Con. Res. 162: Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H. Res. 166: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BACA, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. REYES, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. WEINER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCNULTY, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H. Res. 175: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. PAYNE.

H. Res. 199: Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mrs. MALONEY.

H. Res. 214: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina and Mr. HERGER.

H. Res. 246: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H. Res. 259: Mr. RUSH, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DREIER, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KIRK, and Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 274: Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. REYES, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H. Res. 277: Mr. POE and Mr. MURPHY.

H. Res. 279: Mr. CARDIN and Mr. FILNER.

H. Res. 286: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Res. 292: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. SANDERS.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1449: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 2 of May 24, 2005, by Mr. MARSHALL, on House Resolution 270, was signed by the following Members: Jim Marshall, Emanuel Cleaver, Artur Davis, G. K. Butterfield, Grace F. Napolitano, Carolyn McCarthy, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Dale E. Kildee, Diane E. Watson, Bill Pascrell, Jr., Tim Holden, Doris O. Matsui, Michael H. Michaud, Thomas H. Allen, Bob Filner, Timothy H. Bishop, Ron Kind, Ted Strickland, Patrick J. Kennedy, Wm. Lacy Clay, Stephanie Herseth, Dan Boren, Ed Case, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jim Costa, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, John Barrow, Bob Etheridge, Ben Chandler, John F. Tierney, Rush D. Holt,

Rick Larsen, Russ Carnahan, Peter A. DeFazio, Joseph Crowley, John W. Olver, Martin T. Meehan, Major R. Owens, Susan A. Davis, Carolyn B. Maloney, Gene Green, Barney Frank, Henry A. Waxman, William J. Jefferson, Nick J. Rahall II, Sherrod Brown, Steve Israel, Ellen O. Tauscher, Earl Blumenauer, David Scott, Mike McIntyre, Daniel Lipinski, Tom Udall, Cynthia McKinney, Darlene Hooley, Brad Miller, Betty McCollum, Lois Capps, David E. Price, Hilda L. Solis, Earl Pomeroy, Henry Cuellar, Sheila Jackson-Lee, Robert Menendez, Lane Evans, Michael R. McNulty, Gregory W. Meeks, Donald M. Payne, Julia Carson, Gwen Moore, James P. Moran, John T. Salazar, Bennie G. Thompson, Gene Taylor, Bernard Sanders, Silvestre Reyes, James P. McGovern, Frank Pallone, Jr., John B. Larson, Jane Harman, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Marion Berry, Jim McDermott, Tammy Baldwin, David Wu, Harold E. Ford, Jr., Nancy Pelosi, Stephen F. Lynch, Joe Baca, Zoe Lofgren, Gary L. Ackerman, Al Green, Charles B. Rangel, Bart Stupak, Marcy Kaptur, Bobby L. Rush, Brad Sherman, Steny H. Hoyer, Bart Gordon, Alcee L. Hastings, Adam B. Schiff, Dennis J. Kucinich, Robert C. Scott, Chris Van Hollen, Linda T. Sánchez, Mike Thompson, Dennis A. Cardoza, Raul M. Grijalva, Mike Ross, Brian Higgins, Jim Davis, Rosa L. DeLauro, Charlie Melancon, Leonard L. Boswell, Jose E. Serrano, James R. Langevin, Elijah E. Cummings, Danny K. Davis, Janice D. Schakowsky, Dennis Moore, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Lloyd Doggett, Robert A. Brady, Maxine Waters, Jim Cooper, William Delahunt, Sanford Bishop, Albert Russel Wynn, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Pete Fortney Stark, Steven R. Rothman, Barbara Lee, Michael F. Doyle, Sam Farr, Shelley Berkley, Michael Honda, Diana DeGette, Stephanie Tubbs Jones, Robert E. Andrews, Jim Matheson, John Lewis, Tom Lantos, Kendrick B. Meek, George Miller, John Conyers, Jr., Carolyn C. Kilpatrick, Corrine Brown, David R. Obey, Jerrold Nadler, Jay Inslee, Rahm Emanuel, Collin C. Peterson, Allyson Y. Schwartz, Vic Snyder, Michael E. Capuano, Mark Udall, Tim Ryan, Sander M. Levin, Nydia M. Velázquez, Xavier Becerra, Maurice D. Hinchey, and Allen Boyd.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 1 by Ms. HOOLEY on House Resolution 267: Martin Olav Sabo, John Lewis, Jerry F. Costello, Jesse L. Jackson, Jr., Robert E. Andrews, Maxine Waters, Luis V. Gutierrez, Stephanie Tubbs Jones, Cynthia McKinney, Brad Miller, Norman D. Dicks, Ike Skelton, Frank Pallone, Jr., John B. Larson, Jane Harman, Marion Berry, Harold E. Ford, Jr., Bobby L. Rush, Gene Taylor, Alan B. Mollohan, Richard E. Neal, and John M. Spratt, Jr.

The following Member's name was withdrawn from the following discharge petition:

Petition 1 by Ms. HOOLEY on House Resolution 267: Wm. Lacy Clay.