United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 16, 2006 No. 34

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC.
March 16, 2006.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CANDICE S. MILLER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, how poignant is the Pentateuch story when the father-in-law of Moses boldly approaches the great lawgiver and says:

''You are not acting wisely. You will surely wear yourself out, not only yourself but also the people around you. The task is too heavy for you. You cannot do it alone.

''Now listen to me, and I will give you some advice that God may be with you. Act as the people's representative before God, bringing to God whatever they have to say.''

Then his father-in-law outlines for Moses how he is to delegate his work of overseeing and communicating with the people. He tells Moses to select ''God-fearing and trustworthy helpers who hate dishonest gain for themselves. Moses is to form them into a pyramid of dialogue and decision-making that will reach down to the weakest voices in the community.

''Moses followed the advice of his father-in-law and did exactly what he said.''

Lord God, help our brothers and sisters in Congress to go and do likewise, seeking ''not to be served but to serve'' in Your holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. MCHENRY 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 PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain requests for 10 one-minute speeches on each side.

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY STING

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

Mr. FOLEY. Madam Speaker, let me commend the administration, particularly Attorney General Alberto Gonzales, for his investigation that has busted a ring of 27 charged in a child pornography sting. Images traded worldwide on Internet chat room, despicable, disgusting, disgraceful conduct. Agents from the Justice Department, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and law enforcement authorities in several countries participated in this sting.

This is disturbing news about pedophilia at the youngest, youngest age of children and victims. I urge the Senate to take up the House bill that was sent over in messages to help us rid this society of the scourge of child pornography, sexual exploitation, child molestation and finally get tough with the people that commit these heinous crimes against our most vulnerable. We have sent it overwhelmingly by voice vote to the other Chamber.

I urge Senator FRIST to bring his Chamber together to pass this vital legislation so we can continue to crack down on these monsters.

HUMAN HEALTH IN THE WORLD

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, yesterday we heard the new president of Liberia, Her Excellency Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, discuss the challenge her country faces from the greatest threat to human health in the world. It wasn't AIDS, tuberculosis, even the people shot and bombed in armed conflict. It was the needless death from waterbourne disease. It is why one half the people who are sick today are ill. It has claimed more lives than all the wars in human history.

Today we start the World Water Forum in Mexico City. Currently; the State Department is at work preparing a plan for the United States to meet its commitment to safe drinking water and sanitation around the world. I hope our Congress reflects upon our responsibility to prevent this needless death, and that we step up to adequately fund these important programs in our foreign aid budget.

SOLUTIONS TO THE IMMIGRATION PROBLEM

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

Printed on recycled paper.

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, I am here to talk about border security solutions. I recently spent a week along the Mexican-California border to see firsthand how bad the problem of illegal immigration is, and, more importantly, what Congress can do to fix it. So how do we fix the problem?

First, we need to crack down on employers who knowingly hire illegal workers. Jobs are the magnet drawing illegal aliens across the border.

Second, we need to complete construction of the double fence for 700 miles along the border near populated urban areas. It worked in San Diego.

Third, where mountains and rugged terrain make completion of a double fence impossible, we need to have a virtual fence which consists of infrared cameras that enable agents to see the entire border.

Finally, we need more Border Patrol agents. Although Congress has already tripled the number of Border Patrol agents since the late 1980s, more are still needed. Madam Speaker, the House recently passed a tough border security bill that implements these solutions. I urge the Senate to act now.

NEED TO EXTEND RX DRUG DEADLINE

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, America's seniors are looking for some relief with the high cost of prescription drugs. The vast majority of seniors remain skeptical that the new Republican prescription drug plan will work for them, and therefore, many have not signed up and refuse to.

Congressional Republicans and the Bush administration did not only make this plan confusing to understand, but they also included a provision that will financially penalize seniors if they don't sign up for the plan by May 15. While most Democrats would rather replace the plan for a simpler one within the Medicare system, we do not want to see seniors penalized any further.

Without a deadline extension, seniors will encounter a 1 percent increase on their premiums for every month after they wait to sign up after the May 15 deadline. Since seniors would not be able to begin coverage after the deadline until January of next year, seniors would encounter a 7 percent Bush Medicare tax that would stay with them the rest of their lives.

This is simply not fair. Seniors are already having to pay enough for their prescription drugs. Mr. President, you have 2 months to change your mind. Don't punish our seniors, Mr. President.

COYOTE VS. COYOTE

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, the Old West shootouts continue in Texas. The border war has moved from the rural vastness and wide open spaces of the Rio Grande River to the big city.

Gunfire in the fourth largest city in America occurred this week in urban Houston. A blazing gun battle ensued between rival human smugglers, or coyotes, as we call them, fighting over turf. The outlaws were fighting over the precious cargo of illegal aliens. After the bullets stopped, 21 people were arrested.

The Houston Chronicle reports, the battle for human cargo occurred at a drop house where illegals are stored. ''They are held until relatives pay the ransom to set them loose in America,'' according to officials.

It is reported the fees coyotes charge for smuggling individuals is anywhere from $1,500 to $70,000. Criminals make a profit off of illegals who unlawfully enter the United States. Agents report there is more money in smuggling illegals into the United States than smuggling drugs.

Until America secures the open southern border with Mexico, the lawlessness on the border will spread and breed more lawlessness in urban Americans. Americans and our government must have the moral will to protect the sovereignty of this Nation. And that's just the way it is.

REPUBLICAN DRUG BILL: DRUG COMPANY PROFITS BEFORE AMERICA'S HEALTH

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, the confusing and complicated Republican prescription drug plan will penalize seniors forever if they do not pick a plan by May 15. Unless the administration or Congress acts, 2 months from today, seniors will face a Bush prescription drug tax that will be added to their prescription drug premiums. We simply cannot allow this tax to take effect.

President Bush was in New York this week conceding a lot of problems with the drug plan so far. However, the President refuses to extend the deadline for seniors to sign up. If he doesn't change his mind, Congress must act.

Seniors are only looking for help for these skyrocketing prescription drug prices. They didn't ask for this confusing drug plan, nor is it to help them. But they need the help. This is both a critical health and financial decision for seniors who rely on prescription drugs to be healthier.

Democrats have a plan that would extend the drug enrollment period and eliminate penalties to the end of this year. It is time for us to join together and save American seniors a prescription drug tax that they cannot afford and simply do not deserve.

CONTRASTING ESTONIAN PRESIDENT MERI TO BELARUS DICTATOR LUKASHENKO

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I have time to speak about the death and passing of President Meri from Estonia who died Tuesday in his sleep. Deported to Siberia at the age of 12, he worked as a lumberman, a potato farmer. He got back to Estonia, graduated as a professor of history cum laude, was not allowed by the Soviets to practice that profession, became a playwright, was involved in the ''Singing Revolution'' and became the second president of the country of Estonia.

This is in contrast to the dictator Lukashenko, who as of today, has blocked European election monitors, has thrown out eight Scandinavians for doing polling, and has again arrested Alexander Milinkevich for campaign activities.

President Meri will be able to rest and sleep in a free, sovereign, democratic Estonia, while dictator Alexander Lukashenko will just have sleepless nights by depriving his country of freedom and democracy.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE WONDERFUL PEOPLE OF ITALY

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, today I pay tribute along with my dear friend and colleague, Representative HENRY HYDE, to the wonderful people of Italy.

In the hours and days following the horrific terrorist attacks of September 11, hundreds of thousands of Italians rallied in Rome in sympathy with and in support of America.

Prime Minister Berlusconi visited the United States and in his public statements expressed these same sentiments. He rightly stated that these attacks were attacks against all nations.

A great honor bestowed upon visiting heads of states to the U.S. is the opportunity to speak before a joint session of Congress. During that appearance, he emphasized goals we all share; promoting democracy and protecting human rights. He called for continuation of the global efforts to fight terrorism.

Italy is a great ally of the United States, and I believe we should continue efforts to bring the people of both nations closer together.

As the representative for thousands of Italian Americans, I know, as they do, that our society has benefited strongly from the many contributions made by this vibrant community.

PROVIDING HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE TO SMALL BUSINESSES

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

Mrs. KELLY. Madam Speaker, I represent New York's Hudson Valley, where small businesses are absolutely critical to our local economy. Our local small business owners and self-employed workers have repeatedly confirmed to me that the recent tax cuts are working and helping our small businesses create new jobs in our communities. But they also tell me time and again that one of the toughest challenges they face is being able to have affordable health care coverage for themselves and their workers.

This is frustrating, because we have passed the Small Business Health Fairness Act in the House to address this very problem, yet the politics of obstruction in the other body have kept the bill from passing into law.

Solving the problem of America's uninsured begins with helping small businesses. The facts are clear: Six out of 10 small businesses don't offer health insurance because they can't afford the high costs on their own in the private market.

The Small Business Health Fairness Act would provide them with lower costs, giving them the same group health insurance purchasing power already utilized by unions and large corporations. It will give 8 million currently uninsured small business workers the affordable health insurance they need.

Let us work with the other body to give small businesses on Main Street the same health insurance coverage as large firms on Wall Street.

CONGRESS MUST STEP IN TO EXTEND DEADLINE ON MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN REGISTRATION

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

Ms. BERKLEY. Madam Speaker, if the Bush administration does not act within the next 2 months, seniors who sign up for the Medicare prescription drug plan will be severely penalized. In less than 60 days, seniors who have not yet signed up for the plan will face a Bush Medicare drug tax for the rest of their lives.

The President has shown no interest in extending this arbitrary deadline. If the President won't act, Congress must.

House Democrats did not support this debacle of a prescription drug plan, but we don't want to see seniors penalized because the Republicans voted to create a confusing plan that most seniors believe won't work. Seniors need more time to make the right decision. They are understandably confused.

If the President won't act, House Republicans must join us in extending the deadline for seniors to sign up for the new drug plan. Democrats have introduced legislation that would give seniors 6 additional months to decide on the best plan for them. What is fair is fair. We simply cannot allow the Bush Medicare drug tax to take effect.

□ 1015

A BUILDING BLOCK IN OUR RELATIONSHIP WITH INDIA

(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. Madam Speaker, today we will witness another important building block in the development of the strategic partnership between the United States and India.

By introduction of bipartisan legislation to amend the Atomic Energy Act, Congress will begin the important process of authorizing peaceful nuclear cooperation between two great democracies that share similar values of goals and hopes for the future.

While the title of this agreement focuses on nuclear cooperation, the scope of this proposal reaches far beyond nuclear issues. Improved strategic relations with India will promote nonproliferation, will increase our energy independence, will provide environmental protection, strengthen our national security, and create thousands of new jobs for American workers.

As the global economy becomes increasingly competitive and the threat of terrorism endangers all free nations, America faces a historic opportunity with our friend, India. Our countries should take advantage of this unique chance to deliver tremendous mutual benefits to both Indian and American families.

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

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET AND EDUCATION CUTS

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Speaker, at the beginning of the 21st century, America stands as the greatest economic and military power in the history of the world. We have been blessed with tremendous resources, wonderful natural resources. But the most precious of all of our resources is the human potential of America's workforce.

But we have to sustain the investment in that potential. Today, half of our students will not graduate from high school. And here we have a budget proposed by the President that has some of the deepest, most dangerous cuts ever proposed, eliminating vocational education, eliminating 36 other programs designed to help teachers and students, cutting billions of dollars from college student loan programs.

In fact, 3.7 million children will not even get the reading and math help they were promised under the Leave No Child Behind Act. This is not going to sustain our economic power, Madam Speaker. It undermines our economic strength, and, in fact, it is bound to shortchange our children's future.

EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH AND THE EXPLOITATION OF WOMEN

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, the demise of once-renowned South Korean embryonic stem cell researcher, Hwang Woo-Suk, has been well publicized. Once the darling of the research community, Dr. Hwang has since been disgraced, his research exposed as fraudulent, his methodologies shown to be unethical.

The fact that Dr. Hwang fabricated much of his research made big headlines. What was less noted, though, was that he coerced female members of his research team to donate their eggs for experimentation. This brought attention to a relatively unknown fact about embryo research.

It requires an enormous amount of human eggs, and the likelihood of women being exploited is great. This issue has brought together a coalition of pro-choice and pro-life women who are taking a stand against the exploitation of women by the biotech industry.

They point out that the egg extraction techniques required for this research can lead to infertility and even death. They are right to take such a stand against such exploitation, and we ought to stand with them.

PRESIDENT BUSH NEEDS TO SHAKE UP THE WHITE HOUSE

(Ms. WATSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, how low do the President's poll numbers have to go until he finally realizes that it is time to make some changes in his administration? Either he is to blame for all of the incompetence that we have seen out of the White House over the last couple of years, or he finds it a perfectly acceptable attribute in his key advisors.

With the ever-increasing violence in Iraq, it simply defies logic why Defense Secretary Rumsfeld still has a job. How many mistakes does Rumsfeld have to make before President Bush says enough is enough?

Then there is Secretary Chertoff. The White House can blame Michael Brown all they want for a tragically slow and

inadequate response to Hurricane Katrina, but a lot of the blame should be pointed right at the man in charge, Secretary Chertoff, who as of yesterday put a lot of the evacuees out on the street. And he still remains on the job.

Then there are the Under Secretaries who signed off on a deal that handed over operations of six U.S. ports to a foreign nation. Imagine that, outsourcing our homeland security to another nation. It is time for changes, Madam Speaker.

TRUST THE SENIORS ON MEDICARE

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, today we are just 60 days away from the deadline for seniors to sign up for the new Medicare part D prescription drug plan. This plan is giving seniors choices for prescription drug coverage that will cost less while offering more benefits.

Millions of seniors who were without access to drugs are now getting them, and many are saving thousands of dollars a year. In fact, the typical senior could see his or her total drug expenses drop by nearly 50 percent.

Those with limited income and resources could have nearly no expenses at all. It is a real shame that Democrats are trying to scare seniors away from enrolling in this program by saying it is complicated and confusing.

Fortunately, their attempts to sabotage the program are failing. According to a recent article in The Washington Post, 80 percent of senior citizens polled say they had no trouble signing up for or using the Medicare prescription drug plan.

Another poll conducted last week by Ayres, McHenry & Associates shows that 60 percent of seniors said that they were saving money by using the program. Madam Speaker, I trust the positive feedback from the actual folks using the program much more than the negative rhetoric of Democrats trying to turn this into a political issue.

A NATION PERMANENTLY AT WAR

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, 3 years ago the Bush administration spoke to a doctrine of preemption that formed the basis for the United States' attack on Iraq. Three years later, Americans finally know there were no weapons of mass destruction, Iraq did not have the intention or the capability of attacking the United States; that Iraq, in effect, was not in a position to attack us.

Now the American people know what a shambles the Bush administration's policy was in Iraq. Yesterday, the administration now identifies Iran as the top threat, and states again that we have the right to preemptively attack any country. Are we here on the threshold of permanent warfare, where the administration can keep naming enemies, and the American taxpayers with their sons' and daughters' blood have to keep paying for wars that we should not get into?

We should not only vote against this supplemental appropriation, we should start to call into question the administration's entire international policy. They are setting America against the world, and we are paying for it every day.

THE LACK OF A DEMOCRATIC PLAN

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, a once great party left with nothing, nothing but a nifty little slogan, and that slogan is, ''We can do better.'' Madam Speaker, that is the Democrat Party here in Washington, DC.

It was announced in the press in October that they were going to come out with their great agenda in November. November came and went, they had nothing.

In January they said, that is going to be the time we are going to lay out our agenda, our positive agenda for America. January came and went.

Twice more they set dates to roll out their agenda, but nothing. They got nothing except this nifty little phrase, ''We can do better.'' It is a sad state of affairs when they have no agenda, no ideas. All they have is negative attacks, partisan attacks here in Washington. We need more, and we, the Republicans, can do better.

SUPPORT THE FUNDING FOR FIXING TEXAS LEVEES

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, the lives and livelihood of tens of thousands of Texans in a major hurricane zone are at risk because of defective federal levees that only the federal government can repair.

I am here to ask that on the third vote this morning, our colleagues support an amendment offered on behalf of myself, Congressman ORTIZ, and Congress REYES to prevent another Hurricane Katrina-like disaster. This map shows the area of McAllen, Mission, Hidalgo, and Pharr, Texas—a booming community of hardworking Americans, small businesses, schools, hospitals, and nursing homes.

That is how it looks today. This is how it will look if those federal levees fail, covered not in blue plastic, but in water. Because the federal levees are up to 9 feet deficient in height according to a report of the U.S. State Department.

In order to prevent the destruction of the lives and livelihood of those hardworking Americans, we need the $7.8 million modest appropriation proposed in our amendment. Save lives and prevent a tragedy from occurring by approving emergency appropriations to assist the repair of these important federal levees.

ROME AREA HISTORY MUSEUM

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

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Rome Area History Museum on their 10th anniversary of collecting, preserving, and presenting the history of northwest Georgia. In 1995, five men, C.J. Wyatt, Bobby McElwee, John Carruth, David Oswalt, and Ed Byars, recognized the need to create an institution dedicated to the history of Rome and the surrounding communities.

These founders gathered a group of dedicated volunteers and opened what has become one of the finest museums in the State of Georgia. The founders renovated a building on historic Broad Street to serve as their headquarters.

And after much labor, the Rome Area History Museum officially opened its doors on March 30, 1996. For the past 9 years, Bernard Neal has done a wonderful job as the museum's president.

Madam Speaker, as the museum celebrates a decade of educating teachers, researchers and visitors, I want to thank the volunteers and supporters for making the Rome Area History Museum all that it is today.

Museums like this add richness to our communities and preserve our Nation's history.

LIVING IN A FISCAL FANTASYLAND

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

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, today the Senate will vote on the $781 billion increase in the national debt, the fourth debt limit increase in 5 years.

And the Republican Party continues to push tax policies that will drive us even deeper into debt. In 5 years, the Washington Republicans have racked up more new debt, more than $3 trillion, than the entire debt amassed from 1789 to 1988. We are now borrowing more than $600,000 per minute, $218 billion this year alone.

In March 2001, President Bush promised, ''We will pay off $2 trillion of debt over the next decade. Future generations should not be forced pay back money that we have borrowed. We owe this kind of responsibility to our children and grandchildren.''

Promises made, promises broken, a $5 trillion mistake the President made.

Sadly, the administration and the Republican majority in this Congress continue to pursue their reckless, irresponsible, debt-creating policies.

How sad. How wrong. I tell the gentleman from North Carolina, it is not that we can do better, we did better.

□ 1030

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND HURRICANE RECOVERY, 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM). Pursuant to House Resolution 725 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4939.

□ 1030

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4939) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, with Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the committee of the whole rose on Wednesday March 15, 2006, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 76, line 20.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

An amendment by Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

An amendment by Mr. CAPUANO of Massachusetts.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. DOGGETT of Texas.

An amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

An amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

An amendment by Mrs. FOXX of North Carolina.

An amendment by Mr. MELANCON of Louisiana.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. JEFFERSON of Louisiana.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. JEFFERSON of Louisiana.

An amendment by Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

Page 28, line 9, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $26,300,000) (increased by $26,300,000)''.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 250, noes 172, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 45]

AYES—250

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Berkley
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Costa
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Delahunt
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Etheridge
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marshall
Matheson
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Oxley
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Towns
Turner
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—172

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Bean
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Castle
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Davis (AL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hart
Hefley
Herseth
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu

NOT VOTING—11

Boren
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Duncan
Evans
Hastings (FL)
Jones (OH)
Marchant
Strickland
Sweeney
Young (AK)

□ 1058

Messrs. THOMPSON of California, BROWN of Ohio, HINOJOSA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. HEFLEY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. BONILLA, THORNBERRY, McKEON, COBLE, BEAUPREZ, NEUGEBAUER, OXLEY, COLE of Oklahoma, SAM JOHNSON of Texas, DELAY, BONNER, SOUDER, RYAN of Wisconsin, LANTOS, Ms. BERKLEY,

Messrs. SHADEGG, TOWNS, McINTYRE, CULBERSON, WYNN, KENNEDY of Minnesota, SHUSTER, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Messrs. BISHOP of Georgia, SHAYS, HENSARLING, DAVIS of Florida and PLATTS changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 45 on the Burton amendment to H.R. 4939, I was on leave of absence due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAPUANO

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAPUANO:

Page 29, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 213, noes 208, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]

AYES—213

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kirk
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—208

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

NOT VOTING—11

Boozman
Boren
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Duncan
Evans
Fortenberry
Hastings (FL)
Jones (OH)
Strickland
Sweeney

□ 1107

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 46, let the permanent RECORD reflect I intended to vote ''aye.''

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 46 on the Capuano amendment to H.R. 4939, I was on a leave of absence due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. DOGGETT

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOSSELLA). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. DOGGETT:

Page 35, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $7,800,000''.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 198, noes 221, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]

AYES—198

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin

Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Poe
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—221

Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brown (SC)
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Costello
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
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
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Aderholt
Boren
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Duncan
Evans
Hastings (FL)
Jones (OH)
Smith (NJ)
Strickland
Sweeney
Waters

□ 1114

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 47 on the Doggett amendment to H.R. 4939, I was on a leave of absence due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

□ 1115

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BOEHNER was allowed to speak out of order.)

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO LIMIT VOTING TIME

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I want the Members to know that after this series of votes, it is my intention to ask unanimous consent that for the next series of votes that we have the first vote at 15 minutes, followed by succeeding 2-minute votes to help speed the process today. I did not want anybody to be surprised. I do not know whether the unanimous consent will go through, but I hope that it does. Members are all on notice.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOSSELLA). Without objection, the 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

Page 35, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by $5,000,000)".

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 75, noes 344, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

AYES—75

Abercrombie
Baird
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Berry
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boyd
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Campbell (CA)
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Conaway
Cubin
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Feeney
Flake
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gingrey
Goode
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Hart
Hayworth
Hensarling
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hostettler
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kind
King (IA)
Kuhl (NY)
Linder
Marchant
Marshall
McHenry
McKinney
Meehan
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Otter
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pitts
Poe
Reynolds
Ryun (KS)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shuster
Sodrel
Stark
Tancredo
Tanner
Westmoreland

NOES—344

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Bass
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon

McMorris
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
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)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Boren
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Duncan
Evans
Hastings (FL)
Johnson (CT)
Jones (OH)
Putnam
Strickland
Sullivan
Sweeney
Thompson (MS)

□ 1122

Mr. PORTER changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 48 on the Garrett amendment H. AMDT. 714 to H.R. 4939, to reduce by $5,000,000 funding for Diplomatic and Consular Programs, I was on a leave of absence due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

Page 36, strike line 14 and all that follows through line 21.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 78, noes 343, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 49]

AYES—78

Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Beauprez
Berry
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Campbell (CA)
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Conaway
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
Feeney
Flake
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hart
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Hostettler
Istook
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kennedy (MN)
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Kuhl (NY)
Linder
Marchant
McHenry
McKinney
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Norwood
Otter
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Poe
Porter
Reynolds
Ryun (KS)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shuster
Sodrel
Stearns
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Upton
Walden (OR)
Westmoreland

NOES—343

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
King (NY)
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sullivan
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Boren
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Duncan
Evans
Hastings (FL)
Rangel
Strickland
Sweeney

□ 1130

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 49 on the Garrett amendment, H. Amdt. 715 to H.R. 4939, to strike funding for Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs, I was on a leave of absence due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. FOXX:

Page 37, strike lines 6 through 21 (relating to Broadcasting Capital Improvements).

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 88, noes 333, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

AYES—88

Ackerman
Akin
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Bass
Beauprez
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Campbell (CA)
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crowley
Cubin
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Feeney
Flake
Fossella
Foxx
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Hinchey
Hostettler
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Kind
King (IA)
Kuhl (NY)
Linder
Marchant
McHenry
McKinney
McMorris
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Otter
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Poe
Porter
Renzi
Reynolds
Ryun (KS)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Sherwood
Shuster
Sodrel
Stark
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Towns
Upton
Westmoreland
Young (AK)

NOES—333

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stupak
Tauscher
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Alexander
Boren
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Duncan
Evans
Franks (AZ)
Hastings (FL)
Moore (WI)
Strickland
Sweeney

□ 1137

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 50 on the Foxx amendment to H.R. 4939, I was on a leave of absence due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MELANCON

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOSSELLA). The unfinished 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 redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MELANCON:

Page 54, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $465,000,000)''.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 215, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 51]

AYES—199

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickering
Pombo
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—215

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)

Buyer
Calvert
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—18

Bishop (GA)
Boren
Camp (MI)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Duncan
Evans
Franks (AZ)
Hastings (FL)
Jenkins
LaTourette
Miller, George
Neal (MA)
Putnam
Smith (NJ)
Strickland
Sweeney
Weldon (PA)

□ 1144

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 51 on the Melancon amendment to H.R. 4939, I was on a leave of absence due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. JEFFERSON

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. JEFFERSON:

In chapter 4 of title II, in the item relating to "FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY—DISASTER RELIEF", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by $2,000,000,000)".

In chapter 8 of title II, in the item relating to "COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT—COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND—(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $2,000,000,000)".

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 248, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 52]

AYES—174

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Ford
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Higgins
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Poe
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Simmons
Slaughter
Sodrel
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Towns
Udall (CO)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—248

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boucher
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (FL)
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Etheridge
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Udall (NM)
Upton
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Boren
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Duncan
Evans
Franks (AZ)
Hastings (FL)
Strickland
Sweeney
Taylor (NC)

□ 1151

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 52 on the Jefferson amendment H. Amdt. 718 to H.R. 4939, to increase funding for Community Planning and Development by $2,000,000,000 and reducing

funding for the Federal Emergency Management Agency by the same amount, I was on a leave of absence due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. JEFFERSON

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOSSELLA). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. JEFFERSON:

Page 72, line 18, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $1,900,000,000)''.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 210, noes 212, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

AYES—210

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—212

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

NOT VOTING—10

Boren
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Duncan
Evans
Franks (AZ)
Hastings (FL)
Sessions
Strickland
Sweeney

□ 1200

Mr. MARCHANT changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. JONES of North Carolina, COSTA and BOYD changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 53 on the Jefferson amendment, H. Amdt. 719 to H.R. 4939, to increase by $1,900,000,000 funds for Community Development Block Grants, I was on a leave of absence due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TAYLOR OF MISSISSIPPI

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi:

Page 65, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $15,890,000)''

Page 65, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $40,000,000)''.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 250, noes 171, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

AYES—250

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hayworth
Hefley
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins

Jindal
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kline
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickering
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Renzi
Reyes
Rohrabacher
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Shimkus
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sullivan
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Wicker
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—171

Aderholt
Alexander
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Feeney
Flake
Fossella
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
McCaul (TX)
McHenry
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Poe
Pombo
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Boren
Carnahan
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Duncan
Evans
Franks (AZ)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Strickland
Sweeney

□ 1207

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 54 on the Taylor amendment to H.R. 4939, I was on a leave of absence due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unable to be present for rollcall votes No. 50, 51, 52, 53, and 54. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on the amendment offered by Ms. FOXX (rollcall vote No. 50), "no" on the amendment offered by Mr. MELANCON (rollcall vote No. 51), "no" on both amendments offered by Mr. JEFFERSON (rollcall votes Nos. 52 and 53) and "no" on the amendment offered by Mr. TAYLOR (rollcall vote No. 54).

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT) having assumed the chair, Mr. CHOCOLA, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4939) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO REDUCE TIME FOR ELECTRONIC VOTING DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4939, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND HURRICANE RECOVERY, 2006

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 4939, pursuant to House Resolution 725, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series shall be 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 47. Joint resolution increasing the statutory limit on the public debt.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 4939 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND HURRICANE RECOVERY, 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 725 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4939.

□ 1210

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4939) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, with Mr. CHOCOLA (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 76, line 20.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALL

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALL:

At the end of title II, insert the following:

CHAPTER 9

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 2901. In order to provide child care subsidies to the children of parents who are working or enrolled in workforce activities, in a manner that does not put the child care needs of temporary residents ahead of families already on waiting lists for services funded by the Child Care and Development Fund, in any redistribution of unobligated Federal matching funds as authorized by section 418 of the Social Security Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall

give priority to States currently serving a significant number of children in families adversely affected by Hurricane Katrina.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 15, 2006, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment to title II would direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to give priority to States affected by Hurricane Katrina when redistributing unobligated Federal matching funds.

Texas is serving 6,000 children of Katrina evacuees with child care, despite a waiting list of 34,000 Texas children for child care services.

Failure to pass this amendment will put Texas in the position where its only option for continuing to serve the children of Katrina evacuees is with funds meant for Texas children. The Katrina kids would either be cut off or be allowed to cut the line in front of Texas kids who have been waiting up to 2 years to receive child care.

This Congress authorized $200 million in additional child care development funds for fiscal year 2006. Because these funds were made available in the middle of the fiscal year, not all States will be able to identify the necessary matching funds.

What I am asking is that any balances in the CCDF Federal matching funds be made available to the States whose child care caseloads have increased because of these hurricanes.

Members, this issue is but one example of the problematic Federal response to the hurricanes that struck the gulf coast last fall. Shortly after Hurricane Katrina struck, Texas was given a $75 million national emergency grant to provide employment and training services to victims of that storm who had taken up residence in our State.

When Hurricane Rita hit Texas 1 month later, rather than receiving an additional NEG grant to take care of our own people, we were told to not only use that same $75 million to serve the victims of both storms, but to provide our own citizens a more limited range of services than the Katrina evacuees.

This Congress eventually stepped in to allow parity of services, which we appreciate. Texas has enrolled more than 35,000 hurricane victims in NEG training programs and employment, but that money is projected to run out in July, and all of Texas's supplemental requests have been denied because the Department of Labor has run out of NEG funds.

The problem Texas faces goes beyond child care. Many of the Katrina evacuees who remain in Texas are potentially eligible for TANF and/or food stamps, both of which have education and training components associated.

This has put a tremendous strain on our resources for both programs. Congress previously allowed Texas to tap TANF funds to provide short-term nonrecurring benefits to Katrina evacuees, but Texas and other States also need to be allowed to use Federal TANF contingency funds to provide outgoing employment and training services so that we can continue to move these recipients into meaningful employment.

Mr. Chairman, we also need for unspent funds in these areas to be reallocated to where the demand for these services is greatest. Unless Texas receives additional resources, Texas cannot continue the specialized workforce and support services to hurricane victims unless it diverts funds that were intended and balanced to serve its own citizens.

When Hurricane Katrina struck, Texans immediately stepped forward and mounted an unprecedented effort, involving both the public and private sector. Texas taxpayers have been left actually holding the bag to the tune of nearly $2 billion. What kind of message does that send to other States who may find themselves adjacent to the natural disaster, or to the States who, God forbid, may be the victims of that disaster.

I find it hard to believe that the level of compassion extended to these victims will be the same when they know that the Federal Government's commitments are not good when they know that most of what they provide for the refugees will take away from their local resources and the services they are supposed to provide for their own people.

Mr. Chairman, I move adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment because it would help thousands of children in the State of Texas.

This amendment directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to give priority to states affected by Hurricane Katrina when redistributing unobligated federal matching funds from the Child Care Development Fund.

Texas is now serving 6,000 children of Katrina evacuees with childcare services. There are currently 34,000 Texas children on a wait list for child. care' services.

Texas will soon be in a position where our only option will be to serve the children of evacuees at the expense of children in Texas.

Congress authorized $200 million in additional Child Care Development Funds for FY 06. However, these funds were made available in the middle of the fiscal year making it difficult for some states to determine the necessary matching funds for this program.

This amendment asks that any balances in Child Care Development Funds be made available to states where child care caseloads have increased due to the hurricanes.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

□ 1215

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LEWIS of California. 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 appropriations bill shall not be in order if it changes existing law.'' And this amendment gives it affirmative direction, in effect.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. CHOCOLA). Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair will rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language imparting direction. The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. PAUL:

Page 76, after line 20, insert the following:

CHAPTER 9

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 2901. (a) For recovery of the State of Texas from the consequences of Hurricane Katrina and other hurricanes of the 2005 season, $546,100,000, to remain available until expended, to be allocated and administered by the Secretary of the Treasury and used only for the State of Texas, as follows:

(1) $200,000,000, for housing assistance under programs of the Departments of Housing and Urban Development and Agriculture for residents of the State of Texas and for residents of other States affected by the hurricanes who are temporarily residing in Texas and for community development block grant assistance under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974.

(2) $100,000,000, for costs of uncompensated health care for victims of the hurricanes and evacuees, for long-term care costs of evacuees remaining in Texas, and for mental health care costs of persons affected by the hurricanes.

(3) $100,000,000, for reimbursement of costs associated with providing educational services to students who are in Texas as a result of Hurricane Katrina and for repairs to public and higher education facilities damaged by Hurricane Rita.

(4) $46,000,000, for costs of repairs to bridges, roadways, ports, and channels damaged by Hurricane Rita.

(5) $59,000,000, for the Corps of Engineers for maintenance costs relating to erosion, waterway dredging, and other related services.

(6) $50,000,000 for costs of debris removal that are not reimbursable by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, for assistance to agricultural areas affected by Hurricane Rita (including timber- and rice-producing areas), and for costs of other unreimbursed repairs to rural and agricultural infrastructure resulting from Hurricane Rita.

(b) The amounts otherwise provided in title I for the following accounts are hereby reduced by the following amounts:

(1) ''DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE'', amounts under paragraph (3) for payments to reimburse certain countries for logistical, military, and other support provided or to be provided, to United States military operations, by $900,000,000.

(2) ''BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE—DEPARTMENT OF STATE—DEMOCRACY FUND'', by $10,000,000.

(3) ''MILITARY ASSISTANCE—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS'', by $100,000,000.

(4) ''RELATED AGENCY—BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS—INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING OPERATIONS'', by $7,600,000.

(5) ''RELATED AGENCY—BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS—BROADCASTING CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS'', by $28,500,000.

(c) The Secretary of the Treasury shall consider the $500,000,000 by which the aggregate amount of reductions under subsection (b) exceed the aggregate amount made available under subsection (a) as credit against the Federal deficit for fiscal year 2006.

(d) The amount provided under subsection (a) is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday March 15, 2006, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is offered in an attempt to save some money. If my amendment were to pass, we would cut $500 million from this appropriation. Everybody knows that this is a huge appropriations bill and that it is a supplemental. It does not fall under the category of the budget rules. It is $92 billion. It involves the finances of our military approach to our foreign policy around the world, which is two-thirds of this funding. The other third, 19 or $20 billion is for domestic use. It is a huge sum of money. And we are doing this at a time when we are running a deficit, our national debt at least is going up over $600 billion a year, and we are concerned this week about raising the national debt limit to over $9 trillion.

It is unfortunate that's the way the system works around here. It is very difficult to cut anything. My amendment is an attempt to seriously consider the problems that we have in reining in the spending and living within our means.

The major point I make here is by cutting $1 billion from the military portion of the bill it makes the point that we spend way too much on military operations. We spend more on military operations around the world than all the other countries of the world put together. And we do not have a lot to show for it. When you think about what has happened in Afghanistan, the problems there, what is happening in Iraq and the potential problems that are coming in Iran; yet the money is continuing to be spent in this reckless manner.

So I propose we cut a billion dollars out of that which would be easily done, because it should be cut a lot more. I would then take $500 million of this and I would put it into some areas of the country that have been neglected from some of the hurricane damage that has existed in the south, in particular, in Texas.

So to me, this is an approach to emphasize the importance of foreign policy, that this notion that we are in the business of nation-building, and that we are the policemen of the world, and that we should reconsider that and save money. At the same time, we could reduce our deficit while actually increasing funding for some of the serious problems that we have in this country. So to me, it sounds rather logical to do this. To cut things from, say, building roads in Liberia. Yes, Liberia needs money, but what about the people that have been hit by the hurricanes? They need some money, too. And the way we do it always involves deficit financing.

My approach emphasizes the need to cut in the places less important than any other places, spend the money here at home, and end up actually cutting back on the deficit financing. Otherwise we are going to continue with this process. I see no serious attempt whatsoever, when we bring up supplemental appropriations bills like this, to rein in the spending and even to pretend that we are cutting. This whole idea of putting domestic spending together with military spending is not a ploy to maybe reduce spending. It is the ploy to make sure that people are trapped into voting for both and nobody can vote against the domestic spending, and nobody can vote against the military spending. And yet, of course, spending is excessive in both areas.

But my amendment, the way it works, emphasizes mostly cutting the militarism and the type of foreign policy that we finance around the world that has so many ramifications and unintended consequences and so much blow-back, that it literally hurts our national defense and ends up costing us so much more money.

Long term, to come up with a solution, it will not occur with tinkering with the budget. It will not happen today, nor tomorrow. The only way that we can make any sense out of our spending in this country and on this floor will be to reassess our policies. We must ask: Do we want to continue to be the policemen of the world? Do we really believe we can nation-build around the world and that we can spread democracy by force? The result is then, if we do not like the results of the democratic elections then we say, well, it did not work. We cannot support that democratically elected leader.

So it is a change in policy, at least a reconsideration of what we think we should be doing around the world. At the same time, we have to reconsider the domestic spending.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LEWIS of California. 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 appropriations bill shall not be in order if it changes existing law.''

The amendment includes an emergency designation and as such constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

I ask for the Chair's ruling.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes an emergency designation. The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SABO

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SABO:

Page 56, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $700,000,000)''.

Page 57, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $125,000,000)''.

Page 58, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $300,000,000)''.

Page 58, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $100,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday March 15, 2006, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

Mr. Chairman, we hear a lot about the importance of identifying risk as we make security investments. And who could disagree? However, the President and Congress tend to stumble in putting a coherent risk-based philosophy into our budgets and policies.

I ask the Members to consider this amendment in the context of President

Bush's national security budget priorities for the coming year. The President requests $10.4 billion for missile defense next year, an increase of $1.7 billion.

By comparison, the discretionary budget request for the whole Department of Homeland Security is only $400 million above this year, almost four times as large an increase simply for missile defense versus the whole Department of Homeland Security. I have a hard time seeing how the risk of an intercontinental ballistic nuclear missile attack is greater than the risk of a nuclear weapon in a cargo container coming into our country by ship. Therefore, this emergency bill is the time to address our most critical port security gaps.

I understand the Senate Budget Committee chairman also believes that critical security gaps should be addressed in this bill. Protecting our seaports is a lot like protecting our airports. We need multiple security layers. With international traffic, the first security check should be overseas.

The container security in this initiative, by which containers judged to be high risk are opened and inspected and all container manifests are reviewed, is operating today in only 43 of the 140 foreign ports that ship directly to the U.S.

Since 2002, former Customs Commissioner Robert Bonner has been talking about the value of CSI and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has endorsed it. However, the Bush administration and the Republican Congress have been slow to fund and implement the program. This amendment would expand CSI to all overseas ports that ship directly to the U.S. and allow U.S. custom agents to review 100 percent of all container manifests.

Some may argue that we should settle for CSI in 50 foreign ports by the end of 2007. What about the other 90 foreign ports that ship directly to us? You can be sure those who want to do us harm will know which foreign ports are covered by CSI and which foreign ports are not.

The next critical step is to improve port security inside the U.S. The Coast Guard estimates that $7 billion is needed to bring U.S. port facilities into compliance with our maritime security law and regulations.

Let me tell you where we are today. Since 9/11, Congress has provided $910 million to harden our seaports. President Bush has never requested funding directly and specifically for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, with this amendment, we could install radiation portal monitors at every U.S. land and seaport of entry. Today, less than half of these radiation detectors have been installed. Without this amendment, the Bush administration would have Americans wait until 2011 to complete this crucial security measure.

Customs and Border Protection also need to do a better job in targeting cargo containers that should be opened, and in auditing trusted shippers. The General Accounting Office identified both of these issues, and this amendment would help us get these tasks done.

The third critical port security step is to ensure that the people charged to protect our ports are well trained, equipped, and prepared to respond to disaster.

The Coast Guard enforces port and vessel compliance with maritime security regulations. Last fall, the Coast Guard reported that its maritime security exercise revealed the need for a stronger chain of command, better guidance, and more training. The Coast Guard has also told us it has not completed its review of vessel security and has not reviewed all foreign ports that ship directly to us. This agency, which performed so well in response to Hurricane Katrina, can handle the tough jobs. Congress and the President should give the Coast Guard the right resources to do them.

Mr. Chairman, as the saying goes, practice makes perfect. We may need more simulation exercises for emergency responders at every level of government in order to identify the flaws in our preparedness plans.

Mr. Chairman, everyone knows that we have a dangerous gap in our emergency communications capability across the Nation. The bill provides a back-up communication package for the gulf coast, which includes trucks loaded with equipment that can be quickly moved into a disaster area and to bring up cell phones and public safety radio networks to help first responders in search and rescue efforts. We need this emergency communication equipment in other regions of the country as well. And this amendment would provide it.

Mr. Chairman, the American people expect us to do more than talk about inadequate port security and disaster preparedness. They demand that we back up our talk with action.

I urge Members to vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

□ 1230

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment, well-intentioned as it is, is absolute overkill. In total, this amendment would add $1.225 billion for a variety of programs in the Department of Homeland Security, which is nearly 5 percent of the annual appropriations. I may agree with him on some of the needs, but most of what he is asking for should be dealt with in regular order, not in an emergency supplemental bill.

I recognize the importance of many of the appropriations contained in the amendment, but we have already substantially increased funding, Mr. Chairman, for Customs and Border Protection, Coast Guard, and FEMA over the last 3 years.

This supplemental is about the Global War on Terror and Gulf Coast recovery, not about the regular budgets of these Departments, of these agencies, which we are dealing with right now as we appropriate for 2007.

Now, in Customs and Border Protection, in this bill already we increase funding by $17.7 million. We have aggressively supported radiation detection and cargo inspection technology, appropriating some $700 million over the last three years. An additional $400 million in this amendment, well-intended, is completely arbitrary and unneeded. There is no rationale for this number. The new Domestic Nuclear Detection Office is developing new technologies, even as I speak, and a framework for their deployment.

The gentleman also increases Customs and Border protection, international port security programs, the Container Security Initiative, and the Customs Trade Partnership Against Terrorism by $300 million. Since 2004, these programs have received, at the hands of the Congress, over $430 million. This has fully funded the Container Security Initiative which will expand in 58 foreign ports by the end of fiscal 2007. Through those 58 ports come 90 percent of the containers that come to this country and C–TPAT has expanded to 5,636 certified trade partners that send us container vessels every day.

Mr. Chairman, we simply cannot grow these programs any faster. Money is not the problem. An expansion of this program is more about obtaining diplomatic clearances than money. These countries simply will not take more of our personnel until we negotiate diplomatically with them.

As for the Coast Guard operating expenses, in this bill the Chairman of the full committee, Mr. LEWIS, has already included an additional $14.3 million. The gentleman's amendment would add another $125 million. Mr. Chairman, over the last 5 years, we have doubled funding for the Coast Guard's operating expenses, doubled, from $2.8 billion in fiscal 2001 to $5.5 billion in the current year, and while we have increased their responsibilities, they have funding in their base and in this supplemental for operating expenses sufficient to carry out their duties for the remainder of the year, including overhauling equipment, additional fuel, port security, inspections and the like. So the Coast Guard is taken care of. In fact, they have roughly half of their operating expenses for this fiscal year laying there waiting to be spent. So they do not need the extra funds.

Now then, on FEMA, we include in this bill already increases to FEMA of $70 million in the supplemental emergency bill. The gentleman would increase their funding for administrative and regional operations by $300 million, but it is unclear how that $300 million

figure is derived. The President requested $70 million for emergency communications, primarily for Louisiana, Mississippi and Alabama, although some of the funds are also targeted to Texas and Florida.

The Sabo amendment adds $300 million for ''three other locations.'' We do not know where those locations are or why it is an emergency that they be equipped, and there is a huge difference in the cost estimates. Seventy million will take care of the three principal States of Katrina, but he is asking $300 million for these three other locations. Wherever they are, I do not know, and what they need the money for we still do not know.

The $70 million that Chairman LEWIS included in the bill that is before us fully prepares the Gulf Coast for the upcoming hurricane season, putting in place the necessary communications infrastructure for warning and communicating with the public during these natural disasters. It may be appropriate to position the technology in other locations, but there is no reason to consider an expansion of this effort as part of this emergency appropriations bill. These are decisions that can and will be considered as part of the regular appropriations cycle, which we are having hearings on right now.

The gentleman seeks to add $100 million for preparedness activities at FEMA. We also increase in preparedness this bill by $10 million. The gentleman states we are not spending enough on simulation exercises; but in fiscal 2006, the National Exercise Program is funded at $52 million. That supports local, State, and national exercises.

The gentleman also seeks to restart a program called Project Impact, funded in the previous administration to simulate predisaster mitigation efforts. That program has not been funded for 5 years. Nothing is known about it, we do not know that it works, and yet we are asked to plop down another big chunk of money. Who will administer it? what will it do? and so on—we do not know.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is not a matter of more money. It is a matter of spending the money that we already have stashed away in these programs wisely, based on a sound strategy and a rationale to improve our homeland security. While the gentleman's amendment is well-intended, it is overkill.

This supplemental is focused on immediate needs, not budgetary items for next year. Many of the areas being addressed in this amendment are funded in this supplemental, not just to the arbitrary levels being proposed by the gentleman's amendment. Throwing huge sums of money at these programs is not a responsible way to conduct our Nation's business.

I urge a defeat of this amendment.

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the Dubai Ports World debacle, like Hurricane Katrina, laid bare preexisting problems which some of us, especially on the Democratic side of the aisle, have been struggling for years to bring to public notice.

The ports episode starkly reveals the pitfalls of the Bush administration's peremptory decision-making style, without serious deliberation or consultation. And it lays bare the dangers of 4 years of administration laxity on port security. The Sabo amendment offers us the chance to begin to remedy that neglect.

First, it would expand overseas container inspections to all overseas ports that ship to the U.S. The Container Security Initiative, responsible for reviewing manifests and opening and inspecting high-risk containers, is currently operating in only 43 of the 140 overseas ports that ship directly to this country. This amendment would expand the program to all overseas ports shipping to the U.S.

Secondly, the amendment would increase port security inspections and surveillance by the Coast Guard and would eliminate the Coast Guard's current $70 million energy shortfall.

Thirdly, the amendment would place radiation portal monitors at all ports of entry. Fewer than half of the ports of entry are equipped with those monitors now, and Homeland Security does not plan to have them all equipped until 2011. This amendment would allow each entry point to have a radiation portal monitor.

Fourth, it would increase our nationwide communications backup capability. The supplemental does contain backup capability for the gulf coast, but this capability should be provided in other critical locations; our amendment would add three such locations.

Finally, the amendment would strengthen our disaster preparedness mitigation response and recovery. It would increase the number of simulation exercises undertaken by vulnerable communities, and it would restore funding for FEMA's Project Impact.

This is a well-crafted, well-conceived amendment. I urge colleagues to support it.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on each side?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. CHOCOLA). Both sides have 2 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, yesterday, we cast a symbolic vote that got all kinds of political attention from the press having to do with the Dubai controversy. That vote had absolutely no effect on anything because the Dubai deal had already been killed. So the only thing we accomplished was letting Members of Congress get a nice vote that they could take home, stick in their pocket and show their constituents and say, ''Oh, what a good boy am I.''

Now we have got a chance to do something real about port security and about border security. Is there anybody in this House who thinks that our ports are really sufficiently secure so that we do not need to have more resources? Is there anybody in this House who is comfortable with the level of security on the Canadian border?

Over the past 3 years, we on this side of the aisle have tried nine times to get the majority to increase Homeland Security funding above the amount that you have had in your bills, and we have been turned down nine times.

This Congress is telling us, as this small chart shows, this Congress is telling the country we can afford to spend $64 billion this year to provide tax cuts to people who make $1 million or more a year. They are telling the country we can afford to spend more money on tax cuts for millionaires than we spend on the entire Homeland Security budget.

Now, does anybody really think that this country is in greater need of providing $64 billion in tax cuts to people who make a million bucks a year? Do we really think that we need to do that more than we need to shore up port security, border security and the like? With all due respect, I do not think that is very good judgment with respect to our priorities.

The Hart-Rudman report in 2002 concluded, that ''America's own ill-prepared response could hurt its people to a much greater extent than any single attack by terrorists,'' and Katrina revealed the truth of that statement. We witnessed the debacle in Katrina because communication systems went down, and the worst problem about Katrina is that no one could talk to anybody because all of the communication systems were put out of order.

Now, this supplemental only contains sufficient funds to provide an emergency communications backup capability in the gulf coast. That capability consists of trucks loaded with equipment that can be quickly moved into devastated areas to bring up cell phones and VHF, UHF and SHF radio networks to help first responders in their search-and-rescue efforts.

This capability ought to be provided nationwide. That is just one of the many examples that anybody who knows anything about homeland security understands. It is a serious challenge to the security of this country.

So I would submit that we can argue about the details, and if the majority does not like some of these items, you can easily fix them in conference because you have got the votes and we do not, but anybody who thinks it is more important to provide $64 billion in tax cuts to people who make a million bucks a year than it is to increase our homeland security capability, in my mind, has a faulty set of judgments, and I think they better think again.

□ 1245

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

Very briefly, Mr. ROGERS is the chairman of the Homeland Security

Subcommittee, and is doing a very fine job attempting to reorganize the direction of the country in regards to homeland security. In the processing of reorganizing, we brought 22 agencies together. When you bring bureaucracies together you have difficulty starting a direction that is right the first time. Mr. ROGERS has recognized that.

There is a lot of money that has already been appropriated that is in the pipeline that can be applied to many of these priority challenges. Mr. ROGERS has done a very fine job of prioritizing and pushing this agency. There is enough money in the pipeline to give the priorities the appropriate funding.

So I would argue very strongly for a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. May I inquire of the time remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. CHOCOLA). Both sides have 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I understand the majority has the right to close.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, let me just make a few comments. First, let me be clear. I have great appreciation for the work of the chairman of our committee, Mr. ROGERS, and what he has done in this subcommittee. The work of his subcommittee has significantly improved the recommendations of the President over the last several years as relates to homeland security. The bills that have passed Congress have been significantly better than what we got from the administration.

But I also agree with him that this bill today is about the war on terrorism. And one of the most important parts in dealing with the war on terrorism is dealing with port security and the security of containers coming into this country. I disagree with those who say that who owns and how terminals are operated is irrelevant to security. Who operates them and how they operate them is very relevant, as we have dealt with in this bill in committee.

However, how we provide the other security dwarfs the importance of who and how terminals are operated. How we deal with containers coming into this country, both at our ports and our other ports of entry in this country is tremendously important. We have made some progress, but anyone who suggests that we are there in terms of port security in this country today I think is badly misinformed. We have a long ways to go, and it has been over 4 years since 9/11.

We are not simply throwing money at a problem here. These are important questions, important problems that need more resources; and, frankly, in some cases, they need more vigorous action by the administration to make sure that foreign countries cooperate with us. This is an amendment that significantly improves port security and I ask for a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment. First, this amendment throws money at a problem where money is not the problem. There are literally billions of dollars that we have appropriated in the pipeline for the various grant programs in the Department of Homeland Security, including grant monies for port security. In fact, the Department, in the next couple of weeks will be releasing port security applications for various ports around the country to apply for funding. Money is in the pipeline waiting to be spent.

As I have said before, the Department will be in 58 foreign ports the end of the fiscal year 2007. Ninety percent, nine out of 10 of the containers coming into the country come through those 58 ports around the world. We are there x-raying the containers, manually searching containers, classifying and targeting containers, finding those that are susceptible to suspicion and then searching them.

It is not perfect, obviously. But money is not the problem. We simply cannot send more agents into those countries than they will take, unless we can diplomatically make arrangements. But that is a job of the State Department, not DHS.

Second, this is an emergency supplemental bill. We can deal with most of the problems that the gentleman outlines in his amendment in the regular process. And in the regular process, I will probably support a number of the proposals that he is bringing forth in this emergency bill. But this is not the time or the place.

So I would urge a ''no'' vote. These dollars are emergency spending. They are not offset. And the gentleman is asking us to add another $1.225 billion of nonoffset spending. I would hope the body would recognize that, reject this amendment, and let us deal with these issues in the regular process of the 2007 bill.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO).

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. NEUGEBAUER

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

At the end of title II, insert the following:

CHAPTER 9

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

ELIMINATION OF FUNDING

SEC. 2901. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this title is hereby reduced to $0.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 15, 2006, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Chairman, a couple of weeks ago, or several weeks ago, I think in February, the President of the United States sent over two supplemental bills, one for Katrina and one for our defense. Two bills. Because even the President recognized that these are two different issues, a $68 billion defense bill; a $20 billion Katrina bill.

Unfortunately, when this bill came to this body for consideration, it was combined, not giving Members the opportunity to determine what they think is the best policy, both from a defense standpoint and a domestic standpoint.

I am concerned about the fact that these emergency supplemental bills have really become appropriation bills, and the word ''emergency,'' I think, has somewhat slipped from that process. We should be able to come to this floor, and my bill allows Members to be able to give a vote for Katrina or a vote for our defense in an appropriate way that they feel is good for the American taxpayer.

One of the concerns I have, Mr. Chairman, is that in this 109th Congress, if we pass this bill today, with no offsets, by the way, and a previous speaker talked about there was no offsets for that amendment, in fact, there are no offsets in this bill, in the 109th Congress we will have spent as much money on emergency supplemental spending as we have spent in the previous five Congresses.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to you that I don't think that is good for the American people. What I think we ought to do, though, is have policy that does address the merits of what our efforts are in Iraq and Afghanistan and the merits of how we are spending the American taxpayers' money on Katrina relief. In fact, we have already approved in this body $100 billion worth of emergency spending in other relief for Katrina victims.

What is at issue here is the question of whether or not a lot of the issues that are in this supplemental should actually have been in this supplemental. But more importantly, it should not be allowed for piling on and adding things to these supplemental bills, which, in fact, become a free-for-all.

These are two different issues. How we spend the money defending the American people in our efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan as we execute the war on terrorism and how we deal with the catastrophic events that have happened in Katrina are two separate issues. And I would encourage my colleagues to give the American people the benefit of their wisdom and judgment and have a vote on each one of these issues.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment. I understand the point he is making regarding the concept of splitting bills, however, the direct result of this amendment, if it were to pass, and I hope it doesn't, would be to strip all the money out that we need to restore military facilities and veterans facilities in that region.

In fact, this bill, title II, includes $184 million to replace military facilities at bases in the gulf coast damaged by the hurricanes, such as a fire crash rescue station at Keesler Air Force Base. It also includes funds to replace the Veterans Hospital in New Orleans. Eliminating this title puts these facilities and our military personnel at greater risk.

For those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman reserve his time?

Mr. WALSH. I yield back.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, I appreciate the privilege to address this issue.

And, Mr. Chairman, Katrina funding doesn't belong in this DOD emergency supplemental appropriations bill. We have had now 6 months to debate and discuss and deliberate on Katrina funding, and yet there is still not a plan. This Congress hasn't exerted its will on a plan in New Orleans, in particular, and yet here we have another wave of appropriations that has come in without an accounting of where the money has been spent.

If we continue to do this, Mr. Chairman, we will continue to see more money go down there without a solution in place. And I would submit, and I have been down there three times, that if our Federal agencies function at 100 percent of optimum possible production, and with their hearts and their heads all in the right place, we still don't have a solution for Katrina. There is not a plan.

There are appropriations that are in this. There is $100 million to restore the surrounding wetlands, yet we don't know how we are going to protect New Orleans for a category 3.1 storm or anything greater than that. We appropriated money before Christmas for the Corps of Engineers to produce a study to protect New Orleans for a cat 5 hurricane, but they have 24 months to produce the results of that study, and yet we don't know what kind of protection is going to be there for the capital that would go down in that region, some of it below sea level.

If FEMA, SBA, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers all do their job at 100 percent, there is still not a solution. We need to have a plan, an ordered plan, that provides for levee construction for protection of, in particular, New Orleans, at some level; whether it is a 3, a 3.5, a 4, or something above. The people that are reconstructing their homes need to know where they can put their dollars.

But this does not do it, Mr. Chairman. This is something that injects Katrina funding into DOD supplemental appropriations emergency spending. It is not emergency spending. It needs to be dealt with under the normal process of our appropriations process.

So I would conclude and ask for a ''yes'' vote on the Neugebauer amendment, and thank him for bringing it to the floor.

□ 1300

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim the time held in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. BASS). Without objection, the gentleman from New York controls 14 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I know the motivation of the offerer of the amendment, and I sympathize with his general premise. However, I am obligated to speak against the amendment because the amendment would eliminate the money for FEMA. Under this proposal, FEMA would run out of money in May. The $9.55 billion in the bill for the operations in the Gulf Coast would be eliminated. Housing assistance would stop; debris removal would stop. There would be no emergency communications in place for the upcoming hurricane season, which is only two months away. And $13.5 million for the Inspector General would be cut, almost ensuring fraud, waste and abuse of the $35 billion in supplemental funds we have appropriated so far for the Gulf Coast.

So I would urge a ''no'' vote. Although I understand the gentleman's motivation to try to separate out the disaster funding from the military funding, that would ruin the disaster assistance for the Gulf Coast. I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Mr. NEUGEBAUER for, after a very short period of time in Congress, stepping forward in this case and in other cases with substantive legislation that reflects the conservative values that he came to Washington to represent, and does so with no small amount of courage and common sense.

As we look at this behemoth emergency supplemental, Mr. Chairman, I still want to express appreciation to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the chairmen of the appropriate subcommittees. I do believe, as is evidenced by the courtliness demonstrated on the floor today, that we are not subject in this case, or any other case, to bad people but to a bad process. As this Congress undertakes to change the way we spend the people's money, this behemoth legislation is again an argument for budget process reform.

To the Neugebauer amendment, I must begin by saying Hurricane Katrina breaks my heart. I have grieved for the families who have lost loved ones and lost their precious resources and communities in the wake of this storm. I have supported Katrina funding in the past. And in working with colleagues to offset its cost, I will support Katrina funding in the future, but I cannot support adding Katrina relief to an emergency military bill.

The American people know that Hurricane Katrina funding and military spending are apples and oranges. As the author of this amendment suggests as well, the President of the United States knows this, having sent a bill to fund Katrina to the Hill separate from a bill to fund the war on terror. Rather than this legislation being focused on a disciplined measure to fund our military priorities, it has in a sense become a fruit basket, as supplemental bills often do. Spending that, while it may be worthwhile, belongs in the regular order of the legislative process in this Congress.

We need to get back to saying that emergency spending should just fund emergencies; and military emergency spending should fund military emergencies. Let us separate support for the war on terror and our support for the families and communities affected by Katrina. Let us support the Neugebauer amendment, and let this Congress work its will independently to the war on terror and our desire to be there for the families and communities affected by Hurricane Katrina.

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I fully support the Neugebauer amendment to strike the Katrina funding out of this emergency supplemental. It is not in any way, shape, or form that I am opposed to Katrina funding. Indeed, we have already appropriated on an emergency expedited manner $62 billion for Katrina relief. I have been to the gulf coast twice. I have seen the devastation. I have actually worked in one of the clinics in Baton Rouge and treated some of these patients. My heart goes out to the victims of this devastating hurricane along the gulf coast.

But as my colleagues have just said, it makes no sense to join these two bills together. The previous $62 billion that we have appropriated is going to Katrina without much oversight. The citizens, the constituents of the 11th Congressional District of Georgia, are sick and tired of hearing the stories of waste, fraud and abuse. They want some oversight, and this is the only way we can get it.

With all due respect to the appropriations chairman and the subcommittee chairman, this idea that if we do not do it today, right now, combined with the defense emergency appropriations, Armageddon is going to occur. It is not. We come back here the very first day we return and we deal with this bill and we have some opportunity to have some input. This is what our constituents want.

I support the Neugebauer amendment. Let us strike this funding and come back and do it right.

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his courage in offering this amendment because I know how easy it is to misrepresent what his intentions are.

I agree with the previous speakers, and I am disappointed that these two bills have not been separated out. I am here to agree and admit, as one who has actually been to the gulf coast, that perhaps more Federal funding may be needed. I have seen the human misery. I have family that was there. My in-laws were there. They were among the lucky ones; they lived through it. Their home, although significantly damaged, was not totally demolished. My heart goes out to these people.

But the answer to the human tragedy is not an unlimited check drawn upon the checkbook of the Federal taxpayer.

Many speakers act like nothing has been done already to help the gulf coast, but $100 billion in tax incentives and in other direct relief has gone to the gulf coast. That, ladies and gentlemen, is a lot of money.

And let us also not ignore the fact that although there was a great tragedy that occurred on the gulf coast, there are many other tragedies that occur in this Nation every day, but CNN is not there to capture them on a day-to-day basis.

Mr. Chairman, 38,000 Americans die each year in a car crash, and we are asking their families to be taxed to send more money to the gulf coast; 1.4 million Americans are going to be diagnosed with cancer this year, and yet we want to tax them to send more money to the gulf coast.

There are almost a half a million homes that burn each year, and we want to tax those families to send more money to the gulf coast. Perhaps more money is justified, but until we see the plan, until we see more accountability where we do not have trailers rotting in the Arkansas mud and Gucci purses being bought on debit cards, until we figure out the precise Federal role versus the State role versus the local role versus the role of able-bodied individuals under the age of 65, until we come up with reforms, and most importantly, until we come up with offsets, it is time that we prioritize our spending. And maybe we shouldn't be funding the citrus canker program and Radio-Free Europe if money is needed at the gulf coast. I support this amendment and hope it passes.

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

Mr. Chairman, maybe I did not hear right, but I thought I heard some rather interesting things. Two speakers ago I heard the words ''we need more oversight.'' Really? This from a Congress and a majority party that has provided mighty little oversight of the abuses at Abu Ghraib, mighty little oversight on the question of contractor ripoffs in Iraq?

If you want some oversight, I will be interested to see how you vote on the amendment to provide a Truman-like committee to get into the details of contractor abuse in Iraq.

I have also heard from the gentleman from Texas express his concern about cancer patients who are being asked to pay taxes to support additional aid to the gulf. I will be interested to see whether the gentleman votes for a budget which for the third year in a row will cut the number of research grants at the National Institutes of Health.

The gentleman mentioned the number of people who die in fires. I will be interested to see whether they vote for the recommendation to eliminate fire grants. I could go on and on, but I won't in the interest of time.

So I was heartened to hear those comments by both gentlemen. I just hope that when the bills come that provide the services for the activities that they mentioned, that they will have the same attitude that they are exhibiting here today.

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

There has been a lot of discussion about what this bill does and what it does not do. What it does do is not take away Katrina funding; but what it says is let us break this bill into two pieces the way that the President of the United States sent this bill over to us, giving an opportunity for Members to express their opinions about our current defense policy, giving Members of Congress the ability to talk about and express their opinions about how they feel about Katrina policy and how it is going today.

One of the things that this amendment does, Members would be able to come back for debate on Katrina and have a separate vote at that particular time.

What we need to understand is this is no small sum of money. This is $92 billion as of the last count; and with the amendments, it is probably going to be more. We also know that $92 billion is in excess of 10 percent of our discretionary spending for 2006.

So it makes good sense for the American soldiers, the young men and women that are defending our Nation, that are executing the war on terrorism to have a separate vote. It makes good sense for the people in the devastated areas because of the hurricanes that we have had, for us to have deliberative talks and discussions about what is good policy for Katrina.

But let's don't leave the third set of people out that this body is charged to represent, and that is the American people. We need to make sure when we are making policy in this building and in this Chamber that it is good for the people in America. The American people are looking to us; and quite honestly, the people back in the 19th Congressional District of Texas are concerned about our spending. They question how much is an emergency and what is an emergency.

Quite honestly, Mr. Chairman, I think that combining these bills today is not good policy, and I urge my colleagues to come down and give a positive vote, vote for this amendment, vote for our soldiers, vote for the people in Katrina, but also vote for the American people.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I believe my colleagues know that the Appropriations Committee gives the highest priority to improving and extending oversight to money that is expended.

□ 1315

Indeed, I have personally spent a lot of time working with the Inspector General. We have added money in this bill to the Inspector General specifically to make sure oversight is increased and is very adequate. I am concerned, for example, about the money

that may be available even to east Texas as a result of this work. I intend to make sure that we do what is right in connection with our response to this issue. I would urge a ''no'' vote and appreciate my colleagues supporting that ''no'' vote.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MILLENDER-MCDONALD

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD:

Page 59, line 1, insert ''(increased by $50,000,000)'' after the dollar figure.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of House of Wednesday, March 15, 2006, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to ask my colleagues to support the amendment that I have offered to H.R. 4939, which is the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror and Hurricane Recovery.

Mr. Chairman, I have a bill that is going through the normal process that will ask for $50 million through EAC. But this is an emergency bill and it is an emergency with those who are down in those gulf coast States who are looking for some relief in their elections that are upcoming.

My amendment is a simple one. It merely gives an additional $50 million to FEMA so that they can repair and replace the election infrastructure in the States affected by Hurricanes Rita and Katrina.

On August 29, 2005, the Nation and the world watched in horror as the Gulf States were hit by one of the worst hurricanes in this Nation's history. Hurricane Katrina destroyed life in the Gulf States as we know it. And to our dismay, a few weeks later, Hurricane Rita cut a path of devastation along the Texas-Louisiana coast.

The residents of the Gulf States have witnessed entire towns and cities destroyed in the face of Hurricane Katrina and Rita. In some locations these hurricanes wiped out the entire infrastructure necessary for citizens to educate their children, shop for necessities, and to exercise their right to vote. This is what this emergency bill is all about, allowing the election infrastructure to be placed there to give people the right to vote, because it may be years, Mr. Chairman, before the Gulf States start to resemble the vibrant region of the country which they were known to have before these storms.

And it takes time, Mr. Chairman, to build schools and shopping centers; but when it comes to voting, time is of the essence. The most affected State, Louisiana, will be holding elections in just weeks, along with Mississippi and Alabama, which have scheduled primaries in June.

Mr. Chairman, I have a letter from the Secretaries of State of those States urging us to pass this emergency $50 million and to ask FEMA to provide this. FEMA has denied them before to get this election infrastructure put in place. This bill will do just that.

My bill will add an additional $50 million to FEMA under the Stafford Act. It is my intent that FEMA directs these funds to the States affected by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita to rebuild the necessary infrastructure to conduct Federal elections. As the ranking member on the Committee on House Administration, I have that oversight, and I am urging this amendment to be passed.

Voter registration lists need to be reestablished, sometimes even recreated from scratch; and destroyed polling stations must be reconstructed and made fully accessible to those with disabilities. With this additional money, FEMA will not have to take money away from rebuilding schools and bridges and hospitals and other important reconstruction projects in order to get the election process back up and running in the gulf coast States in time for Federal elections in the coming weeks. And this is not a blank check, Mr. Chairman. The States would have to submit proposals with detailed plans before receiving funds.

Mr. Chairman, I am urging that we do this in light of the fact that FEMA has not, and denied these Secretaries of State the due process of getting these election infrastructures put in place. Hurricanes Katrina and Rita nearly destroyed those Gulf States. Months later, the rippling effect is still being felt by the Nation.

This Nation must provide disaster relief funds to supplement State and local efforts with their efforts to restore and replace supplies, material and equipment so that election officials can conduct credible elections.

We talk about democracy in Iraq and Afghanistan. We need our democracy right here for those who wish to vote and want to vote in the upcoming elections to do that. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF SECRETARIES OF STATE,
Washington, DC, February 6, 2006.

Hon. SUSAN M. COLLINS, Chair
Hon. JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. PETER KING, Chair
Hon. BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Ranking Member, Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. TRENT LOTT, Chair
Hon. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD,
Ranking Member, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. VERNON EHLERS, Chair
Hon. JUANITA MILLENDER-McDONALD,
Ranking Member, Committee on House Administration, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COLLINS, RANKING MEMBER LIEBERMAN, CHAIRMAN KING, RANKING MEMBER THOMPSON, CHAIRMAN LOTT, RANKING MEMBER DODD, CHAIRMAN EHLERS AND RANKING MEMBER MILLENDER-McDONALD: On August 29, 2005 Americans in the Gulf Coast suffered the most devastating natural disaster in our nation's history. Since that time, officials at all levels of government have been devoted to helping our citizens rebuild and move forward. As Alabamans, Louisianians and Mississippians, we are grateful for the hope, service and resources that have poured into our region and we are heartened by the hospitality of Americans in the great cities across the country who have welcomed our fellow citizens in this time of unprecedented need. We write your committees to request necessary assistance in securing the rights of our region's voters. Because a transparent and accountable democratic infrastructure is the backbone of any rebuilding effort, we are asking for your assistance in securing $10 million to ensure meaningful elections.

As we move in our common struggle to. keep the Gulf Coast vibrant in the wake of disaster, we must provide our citizens with the opportunity to participate in the critical and difficult decision making that each of our states face in the coming months and years.

We are honored to serve as Secretaries of State and Chief Election Officials and humbled by our solemn duty to safeguard our citizens' most fundamental right as Americans—the right to vote. The mandates of our office require that we provide all eligible voters, both those that have returned to their homes already and those that are temporarily residing elsewhere, with an opportunity to participate in this rebuilding effort by exercising their voice through the ballot box.

Each election presents our states with many challenges, but never before has there been such great potential for disenfranchisement than in the elections we are facing in the coming year. In Louisiana alone over 400,000 of our registered voters are dispersed in 49 states across the country. Over 53,000 of those citizens have been welcomed into Alabama and Mississippi. Over 250 polling places in our coastal parishes have been destroyed. To date, Louisiana has expended over $2.5 million in restoration of voting machines and associated equipment alone.

In Mississippi, Katrina's damage was devastating. Though fewer citizens were permanently displaced than in Louisiana, our infrastructure in many communities was completely destroyed or severely damaged, due to storm surge along the coast and hurricane force winds that reached as far as 125 miles inland.

The result of this devastation is that limited county budgets are depleted to deal with

debris removal and infrastructure rebuilding, and much of our counties' tax base is destroyed. Much of these diverted county funds would have been used to bring voting precincts up to ADA standards and to purchase new voting machines to meet HAVA requirements this year. Based on surveys from our 43 affected counties, Mississippi's estimated reimbursement need is $4.2 million dollars for ADA voting precinct compliance and voting machine purchase.

Alabama's Gulf Coast area, and 22 counties which were declared disaster areas following Hurricane Katrina, have a variety of needs to conduct their first election on June 6, 2006. In addition to necessary repairs to make some polling places functional, many counties in this disaster area have used dollars normally allocated for election costs to remove debris, repair infrastructure, etc., and these funds would have been used to upgrade polling place facilities, comply with ADA, provide training, purchase supplies, train polling officials, etc. Alabama's estimated cost for the above needs is 2.3 million.

As Chief Election Officials, we are committed to overcoming these challenges, but to guarantee that each of our citizens has an equal opportunity to participate in the election, we need additional resources that will allow us to be creative in educating our voters, providing opportunities for them to cast meaningful ballots from across the country and rebuild our democratic infrastructure.

Unfortunately, our requests to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (''FEMA'') have been answered by a denial that FEMA has authorization under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to aid us in administering elections. The Stafford Act, however, clearly provides the statutory authority to FEMA to help with necessary election expenses incurred in the wake of a national disaster. 42 U.S.C. §5170a. In fact, when Americans have suffered the results of disasters in the past, FEMA has provided aid and financial support for extraordinary expenses to election officials. For example, in 1992, in the wake of Hurricane Andrew, FEMA provided substantial aid to Miami-Dade County to overcome the obstacles of losing more than 100 polling places. FEMA also provided reimbursement for all of that county's election expenses incurred as a result of Andrew.

We seek assistance from the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee and the House Homeland Security Committee to help secure necessary funding and assistance from FEMA.

Each of our offices is currently engaged in determining the financial impact of the hurricanes on our respective election system. It is our feeling that we will need $10 million this year in order to adequately address our voters' additional needs as a result of the storms. In order to most effectively administer election related funding, we encourage a formal liaison between FEMA and the United States Election Assistance Commission (EAC). This relationship will allow essential funds to be directed to the states by the federal agency responsible for issues related to election administration. Consequently, we call on the Senate Rules Committee and the Committee on House Administration to work with the EAC to determine the structure of this necessary relationship. It is our hope that, as a result of this relationship, we will have a procedure for obtaining needed financial resources through a responsive partner.

Time, of course, is of the essence. Voters in Orleans Parish Louisiana will cast ballots on April 22 to elect leaders whose vision will determine the future of New Orleans and its historic neighbors. Starting in the spring and running through the summer, all of our states have primary elections for local and federal offices. Of course, this coming fall, each of our states must administer major federal elections. It is essential to a successful rebuilding process that our citizens have confidence in the outcomes of these elections. Our commitment to this goal is undermined only by our lack of resources.

Sincerely,

AL ATER,
Secretary of State, State of Louisiana.
ERIC CLARK,
Secretary of State, State of Mississippi.
NANCY WORLEY,
Secretary of State, State of Alabama.

NASS RESOLUTION ON FEMA FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AFTER A DISASTER

Whereas, In September 2005 the gulf south region of America suffered devastating losses as a result of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, and

Whereas, other geographic areas have in the past and will suffer in the future from devastating disasters whether by act of god or man, that will debilitate the election process, and

Whereas, the Secretaries of State and other local election officials in the affected areas will bear substantial additional costs to restore polling places, voting equipment, and other necessary items which will enable them to resume conducting elections, and

Whereas, we, the members of the National Association of Secretaries of State (NASS) and the chief state election officials in 39 states, agree that accurate, accessible, and accountable elections are the centerpieces of our democracy, and

Whereas, the state and local governments in the affected areas have and will suffer tremendous losses of revenue and have to shoulder additional expenses in the clean up and rehabilitation of their respected areas, and

Whereas, the Federal Emergency Management Agency reports that they have no statutory authority to pay for any of these extraordinary expenses, and

Whereas, the Federal Emergency Management Agency has provided assistance and financial aid for extraordinary expenses to state and local election officials for conducting elections during past disasters.

Therefore be it Resolved, That NASS hereby urges and requests the President and Congress of the United States of America to direct the Federal Emergency Management Agency to deem these extraordinary expenditures as eligible for payment under the Stafford Act and to work with other federal agencies to expediently take appropriate steps to assist those Secretaries of State and local election officials in the affected areas.

Adopted the 5th day of February, 2006
In Washington, DC

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is just not necessary. FEMA has money and the authorization to go ahead and buy election equipment already, and they are already doing it. This amendment would actually earmark Disaster Relief Funds, which we have never done before. We don't earmark. This is not an account out of which you earmark monies for things you like. These are Disaster Relief Funds that are administered by the government where it is needed.

Now, the Stafford Act authorizes the use of Federal money to repair or replace damaged public infrastructure. That is what it is for, including election equipment. FEMA has already spent over $1.7 million on election equipment in Louisiana and Mississippi. Specifically, Louisiana has received $1,200,100 from FEMA to replace polling booths, computers, voting machines, office supplies, and storage facilities. Mississippi has received $724,000 from FEMA for voting machines, equipment, and election commission furniture. So FEMA is already doing it. I don't know why we need to earmark monies, which I oppose in general; but it is unnecessary here because it is already being done.

There is plenty of money in FEMA's account to replace the election equipment. They are already doing it. So I don't see the need for us to pass this sort of an amendment and set a precedent, Mr. Chairman, for earmarking out of the Disaster Relief Fund for somebody's whim on the floor. We have passed the Stafford Act. That is what governs how FEMA monies are being spent. This would be a violation, in my judgment, of the principle of the Stafford Act.

FEMA is in the process of helping remove debris from the Gulf Coast. Roads are still closed in the area. As has been described innumerable times, it is an absolute mess down there. And while election equipment is important, it is just simply, in my judgment, premature to purchase this equipment, first of all, when there are no structures in place to house the equipment and no roads open to deliver it. When the time is right, FEMA has both the authority and the money to assist with the upcoming election and the equipment requirements. There is simply no need for this amendment and no need to earmark out of disaster funds.

Including the funds in this bill, we will have given $44.5 billion to the Disaster Relief Fund in supplemental appropriations during 2005 and 2006. That is a huge sum. But it reflects the commitment of this body to helping rebuild the devastated Gulf Coast region.

Now is the time for sound management of this money. Arbitrarily carving out specific amounts from the disaster fund would open a floodgate seemingly without end for many, many needs.

We recognize and support the need to repair election facilities. It is critical that we allow those affected by Hurricane Katrina to participate in the most important civic duty, and that is voting. With this bill, the disaster relief monies involved in the bill are in place to do just that and are being spent for that purpose already. So I would urge a rejection of this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair regrettably informs the gentlewoman from California that her time has expired.

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

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Chairman, as much as I hate to disagree with the gentleman from Kentucky, this is not an earmark, nor has FEMA submitted the requisite amount of money that is required for the election infrastructure. They have approved $1 million, but they have given no money; and, in fact, the Secretaries of State have indicated that FEMA has refused and denied them any money at all. So what I am simply asking is that given that this is an emergency to take care of the hurricanes, that we provide the funding for that infrastructure to be placed.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''no'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JINDAL

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JINDAL:

Page 59, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 49, line 16, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 15, 2006, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JINDAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. JINDAL. Mr. Chairman, in the days and weeks after first Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita, it became very clear that the lack of communications was one of the biggest obstacles to a rapid recovery and a rapid rescue effort in the face of these awful disasters.

The purpose of the amendment that I offer today is to use $2 million for the Department of Defense's Technical Support Working Group to deploy in hurricane-affected States existing technology that provides wireless, interoperable, mobile, encrypted broadband communications for first responders, National Guard, Federal response personnel in the case of future disasters or in the case of the temporary absence of communications.

FEMA has already been tasked with identifying and providing existing commercially available capabilities in time to provide responders with this capability before the next hurricane season begins. The capability exists and needs to be rapidly deployed.

The purpose for my amendment is to use $2 million for the working group to deploy in these areas existing technology.

Federal, State, and local law enforcement and first responder agencies were limited in their ability to respond to Hurricane Katrina because they couldn't communicate. The House Select Committee on Katrina identified this as a key failure at all levels. The Select Committee's recommendation states in part that the Department of Homeland Security should establish and maintain a deployable communications capability to quickly gain and retain situational awareness when responding to catastrophic incidents.

My amendment takes a step in the right direction and, importantly, does so before the next hurricane season, which starts June 1. We must provide responders with the capability to talk across agencies, within their agency when customary communications systems like phones are disrupted or destroyed.

This is not, obviously, a cure-all approach to solve our Nation's interoperable problems; but it is one solution that provides a stopgap system that allows responders to talk to each other using their existing hardware from mobile or fixed locations when existing systems aren't available.

FEMA has already been tasked with this responsibility before the next hurricane season. The capability exists and needs to be rapidly deployed.

This amendment does not require additional Federal dollars. It simply provides $2 million and directs the Department of Defense and its technical support working group to work with FEMA using funds Congress has already planned to provide FEMA to identify and deploy the capability.

From a personal perspective, I can state, being on the ground in the days and weeks after Katrina and Rita, this was one of the biggest gaps in our Federal, State and local response, the inability to have interoperable communications.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JINDAL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

□ 1330

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that he has put a lot of time and effort into this amendment. The committee has reviewed the amendment thoroughly, and we will accept the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. BASS). Does anybody seek time in opposition to the amendment?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JINDAL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JINDAL

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JINDAL:

Page 59, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $50,000,000)''.

Page 68, line 16, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 15, 2006, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JINDAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. JINDAL. Mr. Chairman, I intend to offer and withdraw this amendment.

The purpose of my amendment is to restore the administration's request to rebuild New Orleans' VA Medical Center. I do intend to withdraw this amendment pursuant to a colloquy with my colleagues. I want to, first of all, state the rationale for my amendment in the first place.

The VA Medical Center suffered significant damage after the hurricane. It is a 354-bed acute care facility. It provides health care to more than 220,000 veterans who live in a 23-parish region served by this medical center. It is absolutely critical to get this hospital rebuilt as quickly as possible to continue serving these thousands of veterans, our men and women who have served us so proudly in uniform.

Ironically, it was not the hurricane that did the majority of damage to the VA center. Instead, the facility actually initially weathered the hurricane with minimal damage. However, the breach of the levees days later flooded the entire area around the medical center. Let me correct myself, I am sorry, Mr. Chairman.

It was the breach of the levees, not days later, it was the breach of the levees caused by the failure of design and construction. It was the breach of the levees that flooded the entire area around the medical center, the facility's first floor basement and sub-basement. Those floors housed the facility's major electrical, mechanical and dietetics equipment. Of the 1,819 VA employees in New Orleans, 40 percent lost their homes.

Despite this destruction, despite the obstacles, the VA was one of the few bright lights to shine through the devastation that hit the region. Advanced planning, a well-known electronic medical system helped to ensure that VA could coordinate and move thousands of staff and patients to facilities across the United States without a single loss

of life attributed to the lack of medical attention.

In addition, VA staff members volunteered thousands of hours of their time to assist veterans and other citizens in the affected communities to ensure that the aftermath of this storm and the response could go as smoothly as possible.

Right now, the current situation is that thousands of veterans are being forced to drive a long distance or do without the health care they need. The President initially requested over $600 million to rebuild the medical center in addition to the previous $75 million that was included in the December supplemental for planning and land acquisition.

This is an important facility for the VA. I also want to commend the VA for working together with LSU, which operates the city's Charity Hospital. They have announced an intent to try to work together to construct a shared facility, so the new hospital would have the economies of scale, for example, sharing potentially laundries and other facilities with the State hospital that will also need to be rehabilitated, maybe even rebuilt before it reopens. It is crucial to restore this funding; it is crucial that we get this hospital open as quickly as possible.

I do intend to yield to one of my colleagues. It is my understanding in working with the committee, that they will work with me to ensure that the VA does have the funds they need to reopen this facility in its entirety. I think there was some discussion about the adequacy of the funds, and there was some analysis of how much funds would actually be needed to reopen this facility.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's concern for the construction of the new veterans hospital in New Orleans. I would like to state, also, that I congratulate him and thank him for the leadership that he has provided to the great city and the great people of New Orleans. He has been a consistent and strong supporter.

We will continue to work on this issue, and I will work with the gentleman and all other interested parties to ensure that all necessary funding is available to complete the hospital on schedule.

Mr. JINDAL. I want to thank my colleague and thank the committee. With this agreement, I am willing to withdraw this amendment.

My understanding was there was some confusion in the initial estimates about the actual cost of constructing a parking garage that might have caused an inflated estimate.

I do thank my colleagues for being willing to work with me to make sure this facility is reconstructed as quickly as possible so the veterans can get the health care they deserve. I thank my colleagues. I thank the Chairman.

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JINDAL

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JINDAL:

Under the heading ''DISASTER RELIEF'' in chapter 4 of title II, insert after the dollar amount on page 59, line 1, the following: ''(reduced by $142,271,000)''.

Under the heading ''MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD'' in chapter 6 of title II, insert after the dollar amount on page 66, line 12, the following: ''(increased by $142,271,000)''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 15, 2006, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JINDAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. JINDAL. Mr. Chairman, I again intend to offer and then withdraw this amendment pursuant to a colloquy with my colleagues.

The purpose of this amendment, but before I do that, I want to explain the rationale and importance of this amendment. I have offered an amendment to provide funding requested in the amount of $142 million to allow the reconstruction of the National Guard facilities in New Orleans, Louisiana. Replacement of these facilities are absolutely critical for the function of the Louisiana Army National Guard.

Hurricane Katrina severely damaged these facilities, so that they must be replaced. These units are now currently in temporary interim facilities and have less than half the required training area and storage facilities. These makeshift facilities are overcrowded and disjointed in terms of the capacities they offer. Proper facilities need to be constructed immediately to prevent further deterioration of the equipment.

On August 29, 2005, the Jackson Barracks, in particular, suffered massive flooding from Hurricane Katrina. Several weeks later, after the floodwaters had subsided from the hurricane, the readiness centers were again flooded from Hurricane Rita. Together these two hurricanes caused extreme catastrophic damage to the readiness centers that housed the Joint Force Headquarters and the 1/141 Field Artillery Battalion. Portions of each facility were completely destroyed, suffering from building collapses, collapses as a result of the storm's wind, rains and floodwaters.

The damage inflicted upon the readiness center and all other facilities on the Jackson Barracks has rendered them completely useless. The 512 soldiers of the Field Artillery Battalion and the 216 soldiers of the Joint Forces Headquarters are now operating out of small corner spaces in numerous buildings spread across the State of Louisiana until interim facilities can be provided for these units affected by these hurricanes.

These interim facilities should be ready for use in a few short months. However, they will be nothing close to what is authorized or required to provide for mission ready combat units of the United States Army. The Field Artillery Battalion will have less than a quarter of its authorized square feet required for unit training assemblies and a readiness center for a unit of its size. This is the space needed to provide the facilities needed for the unit to meet its wartime training requirements.

The unit will share this space with another unit as well. Not only will it have a quarter of the space, it will be sharing the space with another unit. This heavily cramped facility, though, we are grateful for this in the aftermath of the storm, will hardly satisfy the long-term mission capability for the two units.

Over time, readiness levels to meet training requirements, retention and recruiting will all suffer greatly. Moreover space required to store unit equipment is insufficient. These same issues have also plagued the Joint Force Headquarters.

The post-hurricane plan for the Joint Force Headquarters has resulted in splitting the headquarters into several locations. This strategy is important for recovery of the State. However, facilities for the operation of the headquarters are not available to consolidate the organization at each location. These long-term operations will not be acceptable as this will result in critical management issues for the Joint Headquarters mission providing command and control to the Louisiana National Guard. This will result in poor oversight provided by the headquarters which could significantly affect the readiness for the National Guard.

My amendment seeks to restore the administration's request to rebuild these facilities in New Orleans. Replacement of these facilities should be provided to sustain the readiness posture of the Louisiana Army National Guard. Hurricane Katrina has severely damaged the facilities and these facilities must be replaced, and certainly, we need to send a signal to the Guard that we want to help them increase their readiness even before next hurricane season.

Many of my colleagues have done me the honor and privilege of coming to my state on CODELs to see the damage. Many of you have landed at Jackson Barracks and been accompanied by Louisiana Army National Guard members on your tours. Many of you have seen the heroic footage of what they did in the aftermath of the storm to rescue people out of the water. Many of you are very aware of their extreme sacrifice serving us overseas in Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, I want to enter into a colloquy with my colleagues. My understanding is the committee will work

with me once information is provided from the Louisiana Army National Guard to make sure that these facilities are indeed rebuilt and repaired.

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

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate his great concern for the National Guard facilities in the City of New Orleans and the State of Louisiana. We will continue to work on this issue as we move towards conference, and I am convinced we can resolve all the questions as we complete the work in the conference.

Mr. JINDAL. I want to thank the gentleman and my colleagues. Based on their commitment to work with me to make sure we do provide the funding to rebuild the facilities, my understanding is there are some questions that need to be answered and some additional information that needs to be obtained, but once that information is obtained, that we are confident we can do that before conference.

Based on that, I will seek unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment. Before I do that, I want to thank my colleagues on the committee for working with me on each of my three amendments.

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GINGREY

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GINGREY:

Page 62, beginning on line 1, strike lines 1 through 11 (relating to National Park Service Historic Preservation Fund).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 15, 2006, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) and a Member opposed will each control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in an attempt to rein in what some might see as the most modest of items. Certainly the $3 million my amendment would strike is a minute fraction of the $19.1 billion we are going to spend in this emergency supplemental package on Katrina relief. Specifically, my amendment strikes the $3 million for the National Historic Preservation Fund.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the money would be used for section 106 reviews. These reviews are required to assets effects of certain undertakings on historic properties by activities of the Federal agencies like the Department of Homeland Security and FEMA.

Some may ask, why strike this particular program from the bill? The answer is not because I don't like the program or even that the money won't be needed at some point down the line. Rather, I am offering this amendment today to make the point that if we are passing an emergency supplemental, then we should only be including emergency money.

If we need to initiate a project on or near an historic property during a time of emergency, shouldn't the government bureaucracy just get out of the way and waive section 106 reviews, thus saving critical time and money for the vital life needs of those who are and have been affected by Hurricane Katrina?

Mr. Chairman, I will support the overall legislation because I understand the emergency needs of our troops. It was only days ago that I was in Iraq visiting troops and hearing of their needs to ensure continued success in this war on terror. And although I do not believe the two should be coupled together in this particular package, as I previously said, I have personally been to Louisiana twice and I know we are in an emergency situation throughout the gulf coast. They do need further relief.

My point here today is that we must focus our resources on the true needs of the region, not on a government review program that should be waived anyway. When we have successfully moved beyond this immediate situation, then we can reinstate section 106 requirements for the affected gulf coast States.

I ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from North Carolina opposed to the amendment?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment for three reasons. First of all, some $9.5 billion of the $35 billion that has been appropriated will go to food, housing and other critical needs. So we have met those criteria as much as possible.

Secondly, as the gentleman said, this is required by section 106 of the National Historical Preservation Act. We don't want to get into amending and trying to put that in the middle of this supplemental. I would suggest if the gentleman wants to take that up at a later time, we could do that.

Thirdly, it is needed because an $18 billion tourist industry is involved here, and getting the assessment of these national historical preserved sites is going to be the first step in trying to get back that $18 billion.

Those are three reasons I would oppose this amendment. I urge a ''no'' vote.

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. If there are no other amendments to title II, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS AND TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

SEC. 3001. 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. 3002. Notwithstanding subsection (b) of section 102 of title I of division B of Public Law 109–148 (119 Stat. 2748), the Secretary of Agriculture may provide financial and technical assistance in carrying out such section in an amount up to 100 percent Federal share, as provided in regulations implementing the emergency watershed protection program: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

SEC. 3003. Funds appropriated pursuant to this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in or pursuant to this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414).

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

SEC. 3004. (a) RESCISSION.—Of the unobligated balances available for ''Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Automation Modernization'', $43,620,000 are rescinded.

(b) APPROPRIATION.—For an additional amount for ''United States Secret Service—Salaries and Expenses'' for critical investigative and protective operations, $43,620,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this section or under the heading United States Secret Service ''Salaries and Expenses'' in any other Act may be used to support the position of the Chief Financial Officer until the Committees on Appropriations receive: (1) a comprehensive workload re-balancing report that includes funding and position requirements for current investigative and protective operations; (2) a comprehensive analysis of the methodology used to estimate current workloads and develop annual operating budgets; and (3) a budget formulation model for National Special Security Events: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this section may be obligated until the Committees on Appropriations receive a revised Program, Project and Activity schedule based on current investigative and protective workload requirements, including a comprehensive analysis of the methodology used to estimate those requirements.

SEC. 3005. (a) The matter under the heading ''Tenant-Based Rental Assistance'' in chapter 9 of title I of division B of Public Law 109–148 is amended—

(1) in the first proviso, by striking ''or the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (Public Law 100–77)'' and inserting ''the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, section 221(d)(3), 221(d)(5), or 236 of the National Housing Act, or section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965''; and

(2) in the second proviso, by inserting '', except that paragraph (7)(A) of such section shall not apply'' after ''1937''.

(b) The provisions of this section are designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th

Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

SEC. 3006. Notwithstanding 49 U.S.C. 5336, any funds remaining available under Federal Transit Administration grant numbers NY–03–345–00, NY–03–0325–00, NY–03–0405, NY–90–X398–00, NY–90–X373–00, NY–90–X418–00, NY–90–X465–00 together with an amount not to exceed $19,200,000 in urbanized area formula funds that were allocated by the New York Metropolitan Transportation Council to the New York City Department of Transportation as a designated recipient under 49 U.S.C. 5307 may be made available to the New York Metropolitan Transportation Authority for eligible capital projects authorized under 49 U.S.C. 5307 and 5309.

SEC. 3007. The referenced statement of the managers under the heading ''Community Development Fund'' in title II of division I of Public Law 108–447 is deemed to be amended—

(1) with respect to item number 536, by striking ''an economic development planning study'' and inserting ''the Main Street Revitalization Project''; and

(2) with respect to item number 444, by striking ''City of St. Petersburg, Florida for facilities construction and renovation for the Mid-Pinellas Science Center'' and inserting ''St. Petersburg College, City of Seminole, Florida for the development of a Science and Nature Park at St. Petersburg College''.

SEC. 3008. (a) The second paragraph under the heading ''Community Development Fund'' in title III of division A of Public Law 109–115 is amended by striking ''statement of managers accompanying this Act'' and inserting ''statement of managers correction for H.R. 3058 relating to the Economic Development Initiative submitted to the House of Representatives by the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House on November 18, 2005, and printed in the House section of the Congressional Record on such date''.

(b) Section 5023 of title V of division B of Public Law 109–148 is amended by striking ''in title III of Public Law 109–115 (as in effect pursuant to H. Con. Res. 308, 109th Congress)'' and inserting ''in title III of division A of Public Law 109–115''.

(c) Each amendment made by this section shall apply as if included in the amended public law on the date of its enactment.

SEC. 3009. The statement of managers correction referenced in the second paragraph under the heading ''Community Development Fund'' in title III of division A of Public Law 109–115 is deemed to be amended—

(1) with respect to item number 714, by striking ''construction of a senior center;'' and inserting ''renovation and buildout of a multipurpose center;'';

(2) with respect to item number 850, by striking ''City of Lancaster, Pennsylvania'' and inserting ''in Pennsylvania''; and

(3) with respect to item number 925, by striking ''Greenwood Partnership Alliance, South Carolina for the renovation of Old Federal Courthouse;'' and inserting ''City of Greenwood, South Carolina for the Emerald Triangle Project;''.

SEC. 3010. Section 9001 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''for a 1-time only obligation and expenditure'';

(2) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) by striking ''for fiscal year 2007''; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', to remain available until September 30, 2007''; and

(3) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—The amount provided under subsection (a)(2) is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.''.

□ 1345

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. BASS). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONAWAY:

Page 81, beginning on line 21, strike section 3010 (relating to LIHEAP).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 15, 2006, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have is pretty simple. It would strike section 3010 in its entirety. 3010 deals with the acceleration of the payments on LIHEAP from fiscal year 2007 into fiscal year 2006 by some $750 million.

The basis of this being in there has not been laid. This is not an emergency, certainly. We have had one of the mildest winters that we have had in a long, long time. I have also got it on relatively good authority, scientific authority, that we will have a winter in 2007, that this money was originally set up to supplement LIHEAP funding in that year.

This funding came about as a result of some very difficult work that was done on the Deficit Reduction Act, and offsets were put in place to allow for this spending in 2007. All of the hard work that went into it, all of the groundwork that was laid to convince us that this was needed for 2007 would be inaccurate, I guess, if we were, in fact, to pass this amendment, because that Deficit Reduction Act was passed in early February.

So it has been a little more than a month since the work was done that this House collectively said this $750 million should be spent in 2007 for the LIHEAP program.

I know that there will be those who say, well, LIHEAP has been authorized at much, much higher levels than we have it and than it has ever been appropriated at; but we have not seen any evidence that the appropriation levels that we have had in the past were inadequate, that there has been evidence shown that there has been needless suffering going on as a result of this funding being less than what was authorized.

I would also remind my colleagues that we have a very disjointed national policy in that we restrict drilling in areas where we know there is crude oil and natural gas, the basis for most of the energy costs that we are talking about helping low-income with, we restrict that drilling.

And it does not take a great economist to understand that if the supply of a commodity is greater than the demand that the price will go down. So it seems wrong-headed on one hand to have a subsidy program for our energy costs and then at the same time restrict the drilling for that commodity to continue to drive that price up, which then means you need more subsidies to support the higher and higher prices.

So my amendment is pretty straight forward. It strikes this section in its entirety. And I would encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, what is behind this amendment is very simple. The gentleman would like to hold the low-income heating assistance funding in this bill hostage to drilling in ANWR. He cannot do that under the rules of the House; and so from his standpoint, the next best thing is to eliminate low-income heating assistance in general.

I was one of the three original authors of the low-income heating assistance program, along with Silvio Conte, Republican from Massachusetts, and Ed Muskie in the Senate. And I think I know something about this program and why this amendment is destructive.

Let me explain what happened last year. The House-passed version of the budget reconciliation bill included $1 billion for LIHEAP to be available in fiscal 2006. But just before the reconciliation conference was completed, the defense appropriations conference report was filed, and that contained an additional $2 billion for LIHEAP as part of the sweetener for ANWR oil leasing provisions.

Not wanting to duplicate the ANWR funds, the reconciliation conferees shifted their addition to fiscal 2007. Subsequent to that, however, the entire ANWR package, including the $2 billion appropriated for LIHEAP, was dropped out of the defense appropriations conference report.

The end result was no additional funds for LIHEAP in 2006, despite escalating heating oil and natural gas prices. The committee amendment simply tries to move the money back to where it was originally supposed to go, which was in this fiscal year. The problem, however, is that the language, even in the committee amendment, does not guarantee that that money will be spent this year; it only allows it to be.

Let me point out the gentleman says he does not think this is an emergency. The gentleman makes $160,000 a year. So does everybody in this Chamber. It is not an emergency to us. We do not have to worry about heating our houses. But there are an awful lot of people who do. Only 16 percent of the people who are eligible by income for low-income heating assistance last year got some help.

And the fact is that the average price for home heating oil has more than

doubled since 2001 and 2002, yet LIHEAP has increased only 20 percent since that time. Average prices for natural gas are up 31 percent. Average prices for home heating oil are up 25 percent, for propane up 18 percent, just from one winter to another.

Over 3 years' time they are much, much steeper. So I would suggest that the family that was able to get through the winter without help when home heating oil was selling for $1.16 a gallon, as it was 4 years ago, is going to have a little more trouble coping when heating oil reaches $2.40 a gallon, the average price now.

So I would suggest that to eliminate this funding is unadvisable. I am myself unhappy with the provision in the committee bill, because unlike the original Obey amendment which was offered in committee, this does not even require the funding be provided this year; but at least it allows that funding to be spent in this year or next.

And I think that that is better than nothing. I think the gentleman's amendment, while I respect him and respect certainly his right to offer it, I think that the amendment itself is misguided and ought to be defeated.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I certainly have a great deal of respect for my colleague on the other side of the aisle, but I think it is a bit misplaced to compare the salaries which you and I make, which I think is $165,000 a year, to every malady known to man. Because if we are going to do that, there is not enough money in the Federal Treasury to make that happen.

So I would disagree that that is a very good analogy. We will also consider in this Chamber in a little while a suspension bill that will add a billion dollars in funding to LIHEAP. In fair disclosure, I intend to oppose that as well. But if for no other reason, in order to simplify the world and make it easier on the conferees, my amendment would strike this section out of the bill so that when we go to conference with it, the $1 billion that will be in the suspension bill, I suspect it will get approved, and this $750 million, there would be no confusion that this $750 million is not tacked on top of the $1 billion.

I think the analysis has not been made. The price has gone up less than 50 percent and this funding would increase support by well over 100 percent, from a billion to a billion. So I want to respectfully disagree with my colleague and ask my colleagues to support this amendment to strike this section from the bill.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, let me simply suggest that the fact is that there are many people in this country who have to choose between heating their homes and eating. I think we ought to make their life just a little bit easier.

I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me time.

If the Snowe language in the bill, the other suspension bill passes this afternoon, then by all means strike this in a committee of conference. But pending that, those of us from cold-weather States and warm-weather States need this fuel assistance. I salute Mr. OBEY for working to make sure it is included, at least to the extent that it is. In the conference report, if the Snowe language passes today, then the amendment that is proposed could be stripped out in conference, and certainly I would support that.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, in the interests of redundancy, I would urge that we defeat the amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, we have moved past the point in the bill where the Flake amendment was to be offered, which would have attempted to strike an earmark that was contained in last year's bill for which a correction is found in this year's bill.

I am pleased that amendment was not offered. But I would like to take just a moment to urge every Member of this House to think before they leap on the issue of giving the President the authority for what is, in effect, an item veto.

I find it mindboggling that there are some people in this Chamber who believe that the main institutional problem that we have in this Congress is that the President has insufficient power vis-a-vis the Congress of the United States.

We have a President who has taken us to war on the basis of manipulated and selected intelligence. We have an administration under whom persons have been tortured, and we are told that more than 100 persons in captivity have died. We have an administration that eavesdrops on American citizens without a court order.

And then we say that the problem is that the President has too little power? I would suggest quite the contrary. If any of you are interested in the line item veto, I would urge you to for a moment forget who is in the White House now and think what might have happened under Lyndon Johnson.

This was a President of my own party, a President who lied to this Congress about the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. Gaylord Nelson, from my home State, was one of the first three people in the Senate to vote against the first appropriation for Vietnam.

Can you imagine what Lyndon Johnson would have done to Gaylord Nelson if he had had any version of the item veto at his disposal? He would have put his arm around Gaylord. He would have said, ''Gaylord, you support that war or you are not going to get your wild rivers designation. You support that war or you are not going to get this earmark for the forest service. You support that war or you are not going to get anything that you want in the budget.''

□ 1400

And I can imagine, I can imagine the power that Johnson would have had using that kind of device. I would also suggest I believe that many, many reforms that are adopted in politics wind up being counterintuitive. And I would suggest, for instance, that an item veto could, in fact, significantly raise the cost of doing business in government affairs because Presidents will dangle projects in front of Members if they are ''good,'' ''good'' being defined by the White House. And that could, in fact, enhance the White House's ability to pass questionable legislation by dangling goodies in front of Members and threatening to cut them if they did not.

So I think my record is clear on earmarks. This Congress provided many fewer earmarks when I was chairman of the Appropriations Committee than it has in any year since that time. But having said that, I think it is important, in whatever choices we make about earmarks, to not inadvertently in that process enhance the power of the executive branch of government so that they are even more strong than they are today, vis-a-vis the Congress of the United States.

In the last analysis, there is only one check on untrammeled executive power, and that check is the Congress of the United States. And I would urge Members of this House, regardless of party, not to weaken that check. That check is not just important to the Congress. It is important to the American people.

Not in the 36 years that I have served here, has any President ever seen any Congress change that President's spending request by more than 3 percent. And it is that 3 percent difference that makes a difference between having a President and having a king.

With all due respect, I think we ought to make certain we continue to have a democracy, not an unofficial monarchy, and I believe that an item veto would contribute to destroying that very delicate balance of power between the two branches, and give even

more power to the executive branch which in so many ways is demonstrating runaway executive power right now.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3011. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act or any other Act may be used to take any action under section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170) or any other provision of law to approve or otherwise allow the acquisition of any leases, contracts, rights, or other obligations of P&O Ports by Dubai Ports World or any other legal entity affiliated with or controlled by Dubai Ports World.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any prior action or decision by or on behalf of the President under section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170), the acquisition of any leases, contracts, rights, or other obligations of P&O Ports by Dubai Ports World or any other legal entity affiliated with or controlled by Dubai Ports World is hereby prohibited and shall have no effect.

(c) The limitation in subsection (a) and the prohibition in subsection (b) apply with respect to the acquisition of any leases, contracts, rights, or other obligations on or after January 1, 2006.

(d) In this section:

(1) The term ''P&O Ports'' means P&O Ports, North America, a United States subsidiary of the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company, a company that is a national of the United Kingdom.

(2) The term ''Dubai Ports World'' means Dubai Ports World, a company that is partly owned and controlled by the Government of the United Arab Emirates.

SEC. 3012. (a) None of the funds appropriated in Public Law 109–102 or any prior Act making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing and related programs may be obligated or expended for assistance to the Palestinian Authority or a successor entity until the Secretary of State certifies to the Committees on Appropriations that such entity has demonstrated its commitment to the principles of nonviolence, the recognition of Israel, and the acceptance of previous agreements and obligations, including the Roadmap.

(b) None of the funds appropriated under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' in Public Law 109–102 or any prior Act making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing and related programs may be obligated or expended for assistance to the West Bank and Gaza until the Secretary of State reviews the current assistance program, consults with the Committees on Appropriations, and submits a revised plan for such assistance: *Provided*, That such plan shall be submitted not later than April 30, 2006, and shall contain specific and appropriate steps to ensure that United States assistance is not provided to or through any individual, private or government entity, or educational institution that the Secretary knows or has reason to believe advocates, plans, sponsors, engages in, or has engaged in, terrorist activity.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MINNESOTA

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota:

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

Sec. —. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to allow entry onto the grounds of any Department of Defense installation or cemetery or Department of Veterans Affairs cemetery for the purpose of a demonstration in connection with a funeral or memorial service or ceremony for a deceased member of the Armed Forces.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 15, 2006, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me begin by telling the Members why am I on the floor today.

Less than a month ago, the body of Corporal Andrew Kemple, who was killed while fighting for our freedom in Iraq, was laid to rest during a ceremony at the Zion Lutheran Church in Anoka, Minnesota, in my congressional district.

However, instead of the funeral Corporal Kemple deserved, one where his family and friends were able to share fond memories of their time with him and where his faithful service to this country could be honored, there was, instead, a vile and hateful display. Funeral protesters, and I use that term loosely, chanted vile slogans like ''God hates America'' and ''God loves IEDs'' during Corporal Kemple's funeral ceremony for more than an hour.

As my colleagues know too well, the improvised explosive device, or IED, has been a favored tool of the terrorists in Iraq and has been responsible for much death and injury for our troops.

Mr. Chairman, words like ''reprehensible'' and ''disgusting'' do not adequately describe these slogans or this stunt on this solemn and sacred occasion. Unfortunately, this shameful incident in my district is not an isolated one. This scene has been repeated again and again at the funerals of fallen servicemen and women across the country. We must and can stop it.

That is why I rise today to offer an amendment that will ensure that none of the funds in this supplemental can be used to approve demonstrations at Department of Defense or Department of Veteran Affairs cemeteries during a funeral or memorial service for a member of the United States Armed Forces.

My amendment would ensure that our men and women who have given what Lincoln called ''the last full measure of devotion'' receive the honors they are due.

My colleagues may have heard of efforts in the States to preserve the sanctity of military funerals. As many as 17 have been reported to be working to preserve the solemnity of this occasion. This fact does not relieve Congress of its duty to take action on Federal lands.

This amendment would be a meaningful first step to preserve a measure of decency for grieving families of fallen soldiers right now while Congress considers legislation introduced by my friend Mike Rogers to address the problem long term. Our men and women in uniform are doing their duty in the war on terror and we must do ours.

Mr. Chairman, though I believe my colleagues are being denied an important opportunity on account of this procedural matter, I ask to withdraw my amendment and I urge all Members to support the forthcoming legislation that my good friend, MIKE ROGERS, is about to introduce that provides a lasting solution to this outrage.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BERRY

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BERRY:

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

SEC. _____. EXTENDED PERIOD OF MEDICARE OPEN ENROLLMENT DURING ALL OF 2006 WITHOUT LATE ENROLLMENT PENALTY.

Section 1851(e)(3)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-21(e)(3)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (iii), by striking ''May 15, 2006'' and inserting ''December 31, 2006''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new sentence:

''An individual making an election during the period beginning on November 15, 2006, and ending on December 15, 2006, shall specify whether the election is to be effective with respect to 2006 or with respect to 2007 (or both).''.

SEC. _____. ONE-TIME CHANGE OF PLAN ENROLLMENT FOR MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT DURING ALL OF 2006.

(a) APPLICATION TO MA–PD PLANS.—Section 1851(e) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-21(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''FOR FIRST 6 MONTHS'';

(B) in clause (i)—

(i) by striking ''the first 6 months of 2006'' and inserting ''2006''; and

(ii) by striking ''the first 6 months during 2006'' and inserting ''2006'';

(C) in clause (ii), by inserting ''(other than during 2006)'' after ''paragraph (3)''; and

(D) in clause (iii), by striking ''2006'' and inserting ''2007''; and

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking ''2006'' and inserting ''2007'' each place it appears.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO PART D.—Section 1860D–1(b)(1)(B)(iii) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-101(b)(1)(B)(iii)) is amended by striking ''subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''paragraph (2)(C)''.

SEC. _____. ESTABLISHMENT OF MEDICARE OPERATED PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN OPTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart 2 of part D of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting

after section 1860D–11 (42 U.S.C. 1395w-111) the following new section:

''MEDICARE OPERATED PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN OPTION

''SEC. 1860D–11A. (a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, for each year (beginning with 2007), in addition to any plans offered under section 1860D–11, the Secretary shall offer one or more medicare operated prescription drug plans (as defined in subsection (c)) with a service area that consists of the entire United States and shall enter into negotiations with pharmaceutical manufacturers to reduce the purchase cost of covered part D drugs for eligible part D individuals in accordance with subsection (b).

''(b) NEGOTIATIONS.—Notwithstanding section 1860D–11(i), for purposes of offering a medicare operated prescription drug plan under this section, the Secretary shall negotiate with pharmaceutical manufacturers with respect to the purchase price of covered part D drugs and shall encourage the use of more affordable therapeutic equivalents to the extent such practices do not override medical necessity as determined by the prescribing physician. To the extent practicable and consistent with the previous sentence, the Secretary shall implement strategies similar to those used by other Federal purchasers of prescription drugs, and other strategies, to reduce the purchase cost of covered part D drugs.

''(c) MEDICARE OPERATED PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN DEFINED.—For purposes of this part, the term 'medicare operated prescription drug plan' means a prescription drug plan that offers qualified prescription drug coverage and access to negotiated prices described in section 1860D–2(a)(1)(A). Such a plan may offer supplemental prescription drug coverage in the same manner as other qualified prescription drug coverage offered by other prescription drug plans.

''(d) MONTHLY BENEFICIARY PREMIUM.—

''(1) QUALIFIED PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE.—The monthly beneficiary premium for qualified prescription drug coverage and access to negotiated prices described in section 1860D–2(a)(1)(A) to be charged under a medicare operated prescription drug plan shall be uniform nationally. Such premium for months in a year shall be based on the average monthly per capita actuarial cost of offering the medicare operated prescription drug plan for the year involved, including administrative expenses.

''(2) SUPPLEMENTAL PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE.—Insofar as a medicare operated prescription drug plan offers supplemental prescription drug coverage, the Secretary may adjust the amount of the premium charged under paragraph (1).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1860D–3(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-103(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) AVAILABILITY OF THE MEDICARE OPERATED PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A medicare operated prescription drug plan (as defined in section 1860D–11A(c)) shall be offered nationally in accordance with section 1860D–11A.

''(B) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), a medicare operated prescription drug plan shall be offered in addition to any qualifying plan or fallback prescription drug plan offered in a PDP region and shall not be considered to be such a plan purposes of meeting the requirements of this subsection.

''(ii) DESIGNATION AS A FALLBACK PLAN.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, the Secretary may designate the medicare operated prescription drug plan as the fallback prescription drug plan for any fallback service area (as defined in section 1860D–11(g)(3)) determined to be appropriate by the Secretary.''.

(2) Section 1860D–13(c)(3) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-113(c)(3)) is amended—

(A) in the heading, by inserting ''and medicare operated prescription drug plans'' after ''Fallback plans''; and

(B) by inserting ''or a medicare operated prescription drug plan'' after ''a fallback prescription drug plan''.

(3) Section 1860D–16(b)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C.1395w-116(b)(1)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

''(E) payments for expenses incurred with respect to the operation of medicare operated prescription drug plans under section 1860D–11A.''.

(4) Section 1860D–41(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-151(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(19) MEDICARE OPERATED PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN.—The term 'medicare operated prescription drug plan' has the meaning given such term in section 1860D–11A(c).''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 15, 2006, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have a crisis in this country and it needs to be dealt with on this bill. This amendment would provide for a real Medicare prescription drug benefit and save the Nation's taxpayers a minimum of $40 billion a year in the process. It would provide for continuous open enrollment for all of 2006 and lay any late enrollment penalties until 2007.

Currently, if a beneficiary misses the May 15, 2006 deadline, they will not have the ability to enroll again until November 15 of 2006. This means they will automatically be subjected to a 7 percent minimum penalty for the rest of their lives. This amendment would allow beneficiaries the option of changing plans once in 2006 if they have made a poor choice, and there is no possible way that they could have known it was a poor choice when they made it.

It would create a drug plan administered and run by Medicare. It would require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate for drug prices on behalf of the American people of our seniors that are enrolled in the plan, and they are the greatest generation. They built the greatest Nation in the history of the world and they deserve better than what they are getting.

This would not do away with any of the existing plans. It would just provide a much better option. It would provide lower prices and it would provide these prices that at no cost to the government.

Our rural pharmacies are going broke because of this crazy Medicare part D bill that we have forced on our seniors and on our pharmacists. It is unfair. It is absolutely overpowering to know that our own government did this to good people. This amendment will fix that. And our seniors are still not getting the medicine that they need and deserve to stay alive, stay healthy and have a decent lifestyle.

Once again by independent sources it has been verified that this amendment, if only half the eligible people signed up, it would save the taxpayers $40 billion. If all of them were part of this plan, it would save $100 billion a year, and they would still get their medicine cheaper than what they are paying for it right now. It only makes sense that we do this for the greatest generation and for those wonderful seniors that thought they were going to get treated a whole lot better by their own government.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I must say that my good friend, perhaps, has a prescription for success here, but I must say I must make my point of order.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman rise to make his point of order?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Yes.

Mr. OBEY. Would the gentleman withhold temporarily?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I certainly will.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California reserves his point of order.

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

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Arkansas says, we have hundreds of thousands of seniors who are faced with absolute confusion on this prescription drug bill. What we are trying to do is help them sort through some of the ridiculous choices they are being forced to make.

What we are trying to do is to say that we will move the sign up deadline back to the end of the year to give them more time to sort out which plan best fits their needs. In my State, for instance, there are over 40 plans being offered to seniors.

Secondly, we are saying give those seniors one opportunity to change a plan after May. Right now, if they do not make a change before May, they are stuck. Give them an opportunity to change once after May if they discover they have made the wrong choices in plans.

Why are we offering this on the appropriations bill? It is very simple, because the rules were abused egregiously in order to enable the passage of this bill in the first place. The bill contained an outrageous gap in coverage now called the ''doughnut hole.'' It also contained a provision which forbade, which forbade the government

from even negotiating with the pharmaceutical industry on price.

How did that happen? Because the majority leadership of this House held the vote open for 3 hours in order to change the verdict. The way things are supposed to work in the House, as everybody knows, is that when we vote, these machines open, our name lights up on the board, we take our voting card, we put it in, and 15 minutes later the people with the most votes are supposed to be the winners. That is not the way this bill was passed.

The way this bill was passed was that this bill was defeated at the end of 15 minutes. It was defeated at the end of a half an hour. It was defeated at the end of an hour. It was defeated after 2 hours. It was defeated after 2½ hours. But finally after 3 hours of holding the vote open the bill passed. How? Because the Republican leadership of this House broke Members' arms to vote for a bill they did not want to vote for because it contained these defects.

□ 1415

That is why we are trying to use the rules that were abused in that action in order to correct the abuse and give our seniors in the process a little more time to make a crucial decision in their lives.

I would urge support for the amendment, and I would urge the gentleman not to raise a point of order against the bill.

Mr. Chairman, could I ask how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOLEY). The gentleman from Wisconsin has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, 3 months into the implementation of the Medicare drug benefit, one thing is perfectly clear, and that is the ''D'' in part D stands for disaster. Beneficiaries are being bombarded by marketers and have been victimized by fraud. Forty percent of beneficiaries have yet to choose a plan because they remain perplexed and frustrated. $1.2 trillion seniors and people with disabilities deserve better than this.

The Berry amendment would provide beneficiaries an additional 6 months to choose a plan. This is the least that we can do for our senior citizens.

I cannot imagine that any Member has not gone home and found hundreds and thousands of seniors who cannot figure this out. Only a small fraction are computer literate, and they are trying to figure it out.

Let us give these seniors a little more time to try and figure this out. In the meantime, maybe we can fix this plan so that it can be serving them rather than the pharmaceutical companies and the insurance industry.

This is a very, very sensible amendment. I know that there are people on both sides of the aisle who are feeling the pressure just to give a bit more time to our seniors. I hope you will all support this amendment.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, do I have any time left?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas has 2 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois said it just like it is. Our senior citizens deserve better. We can provide better drug coverage, better health care for our seniors in this country and save money at the same time.

It defies logic that we would not take this opportunity to see that the wonderful generation that built this great Nation, they went through the Great Depression, they fought World War II, and then in their senior years to be treated like this only because we had a Congress willing to serve the pharmaceutical industry and allow them to rob our seniors and the rest of the American people, for that matter, and the insurance industry.

This is an opportunity to right a great wrong. It is an opportunity to correct and fix the sorriest, most disgusting piece of legislation ever passed by the United States Congress; and I would ask that this at least be allowed to come to a vote.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, Medicare, like Social Security, is a solemn intergenerational promise. People pay into Medicare for a lifetime of work, and they expect quality health care when they retire or become disabled. With the passage of the Medicare Modernization Act in 2003, Medicare's ability to continue to provide quality health insurance both now and in the future has been threatened. Congress increased costs for beneficiaries, in all parts of Medicare, as it increased payouts to HMOs and drug plans.

In passing Part D, Congress chose to side with the pharmaceutical and insurance industries rather than seniors and the disabled. Those on Medicare are at the mercy of the private sector for their drugs. There are 19 companies offering over 40 different prescription drug plans in Ohio, not including those offered through Medicare Advantage HMO's. Each of these plans can choose which drugs to cover and which to exclude from their formulary. They can change their formularies at any point in time. Corporate interests are deciding which drugs you can take instead of physicians.

I wanted one prescription drug card, offered directly through Medicare, for seniors to use to cover all their drugs at pharmacies of their choosing. Congress could have passed a bill with both a real and simple benefit for Medicare beneficiaries, and for less money. Drug prices could have been negotiated and administrative costs could have been reduced through a plan directly under Medicare. In fact, the Center for Economic and Policy Research recently released a study showing that if Medicare negotiated drug prices, we would save so much money that we would be able to cover every single beneficiary with no co-payments, no deductibles, and no premiums . . . and still have $40 billion dollars left. Now, we have a program where the coverage is too little, the cost is too high, and complexity is preventing seniors from getting the drugs they need.

CMS SHORTFALLS

The Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services (CMS) made inherently flawed legislation even worse with its failure to ensure uninterrupted drug coverage, its lack of adequate rules regarding drug plan formularies, and its distribution of both incorrect and inadequate information. Since January 1, 2006, individuals either on Medicaid or Low-Income Assistance should have paid no more than $5 per 30-day retail or 90-day mail order prescription. For hundreds of thousands of people, some of whom contacted my office, this was not the case.

Computer systems from CMS, the state, Social Security, and private plans did not adequately merge with the computer system pharmacies use to verify enrollment and co-payment information. What does this mean? Accurate co-payment amounts were not charged, and in some cases, are still not being charged. Charges have far exceeded $5 in many cases, sometimes by hundreds of dollars. Despite Medicare's anticipation of these scenarios, the problem was not addressed until After it hit beneficiaries.

Regarding plan formularies, CMS rules allow plans to refuse to cover many drugs in the antidepressant, antipsychotic, anticonvulsant, anticancer, immunosuppressant and HIV/AIDS formulary categories—another instance of this administration playing doctor. This time, though, it is not just the health concern of one person, but it is an issue of social concern if some of these individuals are not able to access their prescribed medications.

To make matters worse, CMS has yet to correct in writing a major error in the ''2006 Medicare and You'' handbooks which states that all plan premiums would be fully covered if on ''Extra Help''. In reality, government subsidies will only cover premium amounts up to $30.69 for 2006. Many seniors will be surprised when their plan charges them the difference. In a response letter to me, the CMS Administrator, Dr. Mark McClellan, talks about CMS's multi-pronged approach to minimize the impact of this unfortunate error. Unfortunately, his approach consists primarily of a correction to Medicare's Web site rather than directly to seniors.

CORPORATE SHORTFALLS

Without needed information, people on Medicare cannot make a decision. Many who have other drug coverage have not received notice from their provider whether or not their plan is creditable, or at least as good as Medicare's. If they make the wrong decision, they would have lesser coverage.

Want information from the plans? Good luck! These companies have not dedicated nearly sufficient staff to handle questions and information, as you probably are aware. Most plans simply hang up on incoming calls, sometimes after waiting for hours on the phone. This is even the case for pharmacists who are spending time calling to check enrollment information with these companies.

Each company is required to follow CMS transition policies to cover any drug for 30-days, regardless if it is on their formulary or not. Most companies are not volunteering this information, and some are not abiding by it.

PHARMACY SHORTFALLS

CMS has released scenarios detailing actions pharmacies should take to make sure Medicaid and low-income assistance individuals receive their drugs at the proper copay amount. Though the directives are informative and needed, they have not been adequately disseminated. Even when they are aware of them, some pharmacies are not following these directives. As a result, many of these people are going without their drugs.

When we consider the complex, costly nature of the program, in addition to the flawed implementation of the program, the minimum we can give our seniors is an extension of the deadline to enroll without penalty. If CMS can't smooth over the problems in implementation in time, we cannot ask seniors to observe the original deadline of May 15. They should be allowed to make sure they don't have to gamble with their lives when switching to a new plan. They need to know that the program, as flawed as it is, can be implemented in a way that does not deprive them of their medicines. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Berry Amendment.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, yesterday, a woman told President Bush that she was having a hard time understanding his prescription drug program and needed more time so that she could make an informed choice for her mother.

Bush told her too bad. Specifically, he said, "Rolling back good deadlines is not going to help your mom make a good decision."

He's wrong. The implementation of this drug program has been a disaster. That's not a partisan statement, it's a factual one. Delaying the May 15th deadline until the end of 2006 should be a no-brainer.

Senior citizens and people with disabilities shouldn't be forced to pay financial penalties for the rest of their lives because the law was poorly implemented. Nor should we allow the confusion of the last few months to turn beneficiaries off from ever entering the program.

Yet, if the deadline goes into effect, that's exactly what will happen. According to the Congressional Budget Office 10 million seniors will pay higher premiums for their prescription drugs for the rest of their lives if this deadline is not delayed. And more than 1 million seniors will choose not to enroll this year.

Mr. Bush has long claimed to be a compassionate conservative. There is nothing compassionate about telling America's seniors too bad and forcing them to pay higher premiums for the rest of their lives.

My Republican colleagues keep complaining that Democrats are demagoguing the drug bill. We are not. We are here today trying to help them make it work better. I urge them to join us in that effort.

America's seniors need and deserve a Medicare drug benefit that is user-friendly, affordable, and stable. Vote for the Berry Amendment to do just that.

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

POINT OF ORDER

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California insist on his point of order?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I do.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. 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: any amendment in a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law. This amendment directly amends existing law.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I do.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, it is ironic that the same rules that were abused in order to pass this legislation in the first place are now being hidden behind the majority in order to prevent us from correcting the flaws in that legislation. We could correct those flaws if the majority refrained from offering their point of order. Unfortunately, it appears that they are going to insist, and so they will have again selectively used the rules of this House to accomplish an end which would not have been reachable had the rules been adhered to in the first instance.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Are there any other Members who wish to argue the point of order?

The Chair finds that this amendment directly amends existing law. The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. DELAURO:

Page 84, after line 17, insert the following section:

SEC. 3013. Effective September 30, 2006, sections 319F–3 and 319F–4 of the Public Health Service Act (relating to liability protections for pandemic and epidemic products and security countermeasures), as added by division C of Public Law 109–148 (119 Stat. 2818), are repealed.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 15, 2006, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

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

This amendment is very simple. It repeals the comprehensive liability protection for vaccine manufacturers by the end of the fiscal year, September 30. I believe some sort of liability protection or indemnification is necessary and appropriate to encourage the development and the manufacture of some measures that are going to deal with a pandemic flu. I would support reasonable language.

Whatever our respective views are about the wisdom of liability protection, the manner in which this particular provision was included in the defense appropriation bill last year is indefensible.

Last December, legislation granting liability protection to the vaccine manufacturers was unilaterally inserted into the defense appropriations bill after the conference had closed, after an understanding verbally and in writing that no legislative liability language would be inserted into the bill. It was done in the dead of night, absent any careful consideration, no public hearings or debate among the Members of this body, nothing. It was the work of one person and one body. It should never have been allowed.

Further, there are now no means for victims who are seriously injured to seek compensation, unlike other Federal vaccine programs: swine flu, smallpox, children's vaccines. Usually when government grants liability exemptions to companies, it provides some form of relief for the consumers who are injured.

As we further discovered about this bill, the liability protection was granted not only to vaccines being developed to prepare us for an avian flu outbreak but also for a far broader range of potential vaccines and medical equipment, just about anything else the HHS Secretary deems appropriate.

This sweeping, unchecked power granted to a Cabinet Secretary is unprecedented, to my knowledge, also sweeping power granted to the pharmaceutical industry. The Congress ought to consider carefully before ceding its authority to this or any administration.

Under this law, manufacturers and their suppliers, distributors and their employees would be shielded from a lawsuit, even if they turned out to be negligent or reckless. None of us would agree that a negligent distributor, someone who ruined a vaccine by mishandling it, for example, should be held harmless. Do we want to say a drug maker who knows a product is defective but chooses to sell it anyway is above the law?

We face a frightening prospect that millions of Americans could contract this deadly flu. Our first priority ought to be inoculating the American public from a deadly strain of flu and not inoculating pharmaceutical companies from the threat of legal liability.

This provision has serious implications. All my amendment seeks to achieve is to grant the full Congress and the committees of jurisdiction the opportunity to fully consider the policy implications of this issue. It accomplishes that by sunsetting comprehensive liability protection to the drug manufacturers beyond this fiscal year. It gives us plenty of time to have

the appropriate parties debate this issue thoroughly.

Lastly, let me say a word about the rationale for making this amendment in order, because I understand that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are preparing to challenge it on the basis of it being in violation of rule XXI and rule XVI, and that is certainly their right.

But before they do, let me ask, where was the concern for the rules when a Member of the other body unilaterally rewrote liability law in this country? Given the complete abdication of procedural norms which made this provision's enactment possible, which we have seen time and time again in this institution, I would ask the majority, spare us the lectures about the need to respect House rules in this instance.

Mr. Chairman, the House should have a full debate on this measure and an up-or-down vote. Let us give this institution the opportunity to reclaim the dignity, and constitutional authority, that the majority renounced in allowing one Member to usurp the power of this body, to bolster himself on this critical issue. That is what this amendment is about.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, we are here because last year on the defense appropriations bill, in the middle of the night, we were trying to finish action on that bill, and we had agreed that we would add the administration's request for $7 billion to fund a research program to develop vaccines to deal with avian flu. When the majority produced their bill, it only had $3.5 billion. We asked why the other money that was requested by the administration was not included. I was told by Senator STEVENS, the chairman of the conference, that that was because the majority party had decided that they would not deal with the issue of drug company indemnification, and until they did, they were not going to put the long-term money in the bill.

So they told us in writing, as well as orally, that they were not going to add any language indemnifying the drug companies. The conference ended about eight o'clock.

Close to midnight, the majority leader of the United States Senate walked over to the Speaker's office and insisted that 40 pages of language never read or never checked out by anybody, that 40 pages of language never voted on by anybody be inserted in that conference report without a vote of the conferees, and that was jammed down our throats the next day.

That language purported to protect drug companies in case they made some faulty flu vaccine; but, in fact, the language went far beyond that. It applied to all vaccines, it applied to all drugs and all medical devices that the Secretary chose to apply it to. It provided no possibility for judicial review at all. So in other words, it said if you get sick, if you lose your health because of a faulty vaccine or a faulty device, you cannot sue the drug company; you have to collect from the government.

But guess what? They put no money in the fund that was supposed to be used to compensate victims. So it was a catch-22.

We are here today because, in my view, that action inserting that language, without a vote of the conferees, was one of the most egregious corruptions of the legislative process that I have seen in the 37 years that I have been here. And we are trying to use the rules of the House today to reverse what happened because of an egregious abuse of those rules by the leadership of this House and by the leadership of the Senate.

Of all people, of all people in the Congress, the leadership of both Houses have an obligation to protect the integrity of the institution and the integrity of the rules. When they themselves lead the charge to obliterate any opportunity to use the rules in defense of normal processes in this House, then, in my view, they have ultimately corrupted the process of legislation.

So this amendment ordinarily would not be here, but the damage was done on this bill last year, and so we are trying to use the same vehicle to undo the damage. We recognize there needs to be some indemnification language, but it needs to be reviewed by somebody other than drug company lobbyists; and until that happens, I am going to continue to be mad as hell about this and do everything I possibly can to reverse the outcome.

We are trying to preach democracy in Iraq. It would be nice if the leadership of this Congress showed some here at home in this institution.

□ 1430

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOLEY). The gentlewoman has 30 seconds remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. I would just conclude by saying that this is about inoculating the American public against a deadly flu. We are not in the business and we are not charged with inoculating the pharmaceutical companies from the threat of legal liability. That is not why we were sent to the United States Congress. We are here to protect the public interest and the public trust.

Let us do our job. Let the appropriate committees of jurisdiction deal with this issue; have the companies, have the consumers bring people together. That is simply what this legislation and my amendment is all about.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LEWIS of California. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I must say that I think you know me well; that my colleagues do as well. I feel very strongly about the rules of the House and I feel very strongly about the way we operate with each other. I must say I have regretted from time to time all the lessons learned when the former majority ran the House. But because of that experience, I must propound my point of order.

So, 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 appropriations bill shall not be in order if it changes existing law.'' This proposal directly changes existing law.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be recognized on the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that what the gentleman is suggesting by insisting on his point of order is that the rules of this House may be bent by the majority in order to provide special interest language in a piece of legislation, but they cannot be used by the minority to defend the public interest in that same case. I would find that a strange interpretation of the rules indeed.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? Hearing none, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds this amendment repeals existing law. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, because this is the only way that we can protest this egregious corruption of the rules of the House, I respectfully appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Committee of the Whole?

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, and the order of the House of today, this 15-minute vote on the appeal of the ruling of the Chair will be followed by the following amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order: The amendment by Mr. SABO of Minnesota, 5-minute vote; the amendment by Mr. NEUGEBAUER of Texas, a 2-minute vote; the amendment by Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD of California, a 2-minute vote; the amendment by Mr. CONAWAY of Texas, a 2-minute vote.

The Chair wishes to underscore the 2-minute vote was agreed to by this

Chamber. We will hold those votes strictly to 2 minutes. Members are advised to watch the board that they have properly recorded their votes during those 2-minute votes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 223, noes 193, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 55]

AYES—223

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

NOES—193

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Herseth
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—16

Boren
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Duncan
Evans
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Jindal
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Oxley
Putnam
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Strickland
Sweeney

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOLEY) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1457

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. McKINNEY, Messrs. ROTHMAN, EDWARDS, TAYLOR of Mississippi and Melancon changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. REGULA, BOOZMAN, BUYER and TOM DAVIS of Virginia changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the decision of the Chair stands as the judgment of the Committee.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 55, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

(By unanimous consent, Ms. ESHOO was allowed to speak out of order.)

HONORING PROFILES IN COURAGE RECIPIENT

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the publication of John F. Kennedy's book ''Profiles in Courage.''

Last Thursday, one of our colleagues was chosen as the recipient for this year, the 50th anniversary of President Kennedy's book ''Profiles in Courage,'' as the Profile of Courage in the year 2006.

Our distinguished colleague, Congressman JOHN MURTHA, is the recipient in 2006. We want to pay tribute to Congressman JOHN MURTHA as the recipient of the John F. Kennedy Profiles in Courage Award recipient.

Congratulations, JACK.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, reduced-time voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The Chair reminds Members this 5-minute vote will be followed by three 2-minute votes.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SABO

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 208, noes 210, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

AYES—208

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Ford
Frank (MA)
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hayworth
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy

McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Renzi
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Serrano
Shadegg
Sherman
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—210

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

NOT VOTING—14

Boren
Buyer
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Duncan
Evans
Hastings (FL)
Johnson (CT)
Knollenberg
Miller (FL)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Strickland
Sweeney

□ 1508

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. NEUGEBAUER

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOLEY). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote. Recorded votes on the remaining questions in this series will be conducted as 2-minute votes. Members are asked to remain in the Chamber. Members also should be aware that they can greatly expedite the process by recording their votes electronically at the voting stations rather than by ballot card in the well.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 89, noes 332, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

AYES—89

Akin
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Biggert
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Buyer
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Chabot
Coble
Conaway
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Graves
Gutknecht
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hostettler
Inglis (SC)
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Kuhl (NY)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McHenry
McKinney
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Neugebauer
Norwood
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe
Price (GA)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sessions
Shadegg
Shuster
Sodrel
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Tiahrt
Westmoreland
Young (AK)

NOES—332

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
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)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Boren
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Duncan
Evans
Hastings (FL)
Knollenberg
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Strickland
Sweeney

□ 1512

Mr. ROTHMAN changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MILLENDER-MCDONALD

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 227, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

AYES—194

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—227

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

NOT VOTING—11

Boren
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Duncan
Evans
Hastings (FL)
Knollenberg
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Strickland
Sweeney

□ 1516

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOLEY). Twenty seconds remain in this vote.

Mr. MARKEY changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOLEY). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 76, noes 342, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

AYES—76

Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Chabot
Coble
Conaway
Cubin
Culberson
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, M.
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Gutknecht
Harris
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hostettler
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Johnson, Sam
King (IA)
Kingston
Kolbe
Linder
Lucas
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McHenry
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Norwood
Otter
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Pitts
Price (GA)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryun (KS)
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Tancredo
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Wamp
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)

NOES—342

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert

Camp (MI)
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hyde
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Boren
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Duncan
Evans
Hastings (FL)
Istook
Knollenberg
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Strickland
Sweeney

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Fifteen seconds remain in this vote.

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KNOLLENBERG: Mr. Chairman, on March 16, 2006, I was unavoidably absent and missed rollcall votes 55–59. For the record, had I been present, I would have voted: No. 55—"yea"; No. 56—"nay"; No. 57—"nay"; No. 58—"nay"; 59—"nay."

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California) assumed the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

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

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND HURRICANE RECOVERY, 2006

The Committee resumed its sitting.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman of the full committee for yielding to me for purposes of this colloquy. I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, this goes to the issue of $50 million in economic support funds for Liberia. What I wanted to say, on this issue, is that the United States has been very generous with Liberia. We have committed nearly $1.5 billion, and that includes the funding for U.N. peacekeeping, and of course President Bush deployed U.S. Marines in Liberia to end the fighting there. My concern is that the former Liberian President, Charles Taylor, frankly, is first among warlords. He faces a 17-count indictment by the U.S. backed Special Court for his crimes against humanity, and yet he is living in cushy exile in Nigeria.

This is a problem on several counts. Taylor must face justice for the killing and maiming that he engineered. Bringing him to the Special Court will end the cycle of impunity that destabilizes West Africa, and most pressing to today's business, Taylor remains a threat to the progress that the U.S. has done so much to achieve. It is probable that left in exile, Taylor will return to Liberia, as he has pledged to do, and knock over all that we have helped build up, throwing that region back into chaos.

Congress passed a resolution calling for Taylor to be sent to the Special Court. Yesterday, Liberia's new President addressed this Congress. She had an inspiring message. But what many human rights and civil society groups were hoping to hear was a loud and clear call for Taylor to be turned over to the court now before it is too late. While Taylor is in Nigeria, Nigeria's president has said he would honor an extradition request made by Liberia's new president. We are waiting for that request.

This bill would tack on an added $50 million in emergency spending for Liberia. I am worried about the message this sends about our seriousness of purpose regarding Charles Taylor. We continue our generosity, yet the Liberian president continues to defy the wishes of many Liberians by not acting to bring Charles Taylor to justice.

So, Mr. Chairman, I considered offering an amendment to strike or condition this $50 million. What I seek instead is to hear from you on this issue.

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I particularly thank him for his longstanding effort on behalf of West African nations and the people of West Africa, and certainly Liberia. I share his concern about a long lasting peace for Liberia, as I know all in this body do, and we also share the concern that Charles Taylor represents a threat to everything that the United States is trying to accomplish through its aid efforts and its commitment of troops to bring about peace and stability in Liberia.

I will tell the gentleman as this process unfolds, the committee has been and will continue to closely monitor developments with Charles Taylor.

I think I have some good news I can bring to the gentleman. Just before this series of votes, Mrs. LOWEY, my ranking member, and I completed a meeting with President Sirleaf, who, of course, addressed this body yesterday. We asked this question specifically, will there be an extradition request? I asked it three times, and got the same answer three times, that it has been done. She used the word ''done'' three times. So the request for extradition has been done. We believe and she has said that he needs to be brought to justice in an appropriate court.

So the request to the President of Liberia has been made. She went on to tell us that President Olusegun is now consulting with African leaders from the African Union and the Economic Community of West African Countries, ECOWAS, to make sure that the extradition will not in any way destabilize

the very fragile peace that now exists there. Once that is done, we would expect to see this accomplished.

The request for extradition has been done, and we will continue to remain engaged and watch this very, very closely, as this process of the supplemental unfolds.

Mr. ROYCE. I thank the gentleman from Arizona and the gentlewoman from New York, and certainly the chairman of the committee.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 26 offered by Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 4939

On page 84, after line 17, insert the following:

TITLE IV—ESTABLISHMENT OF A ''TRUMAN'' INVESTIGATIVE COMMITTEE TO PROTECT AGAINST WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE RELATED TO CONTRACTS FOR THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM AND HURRICANES KATRINA AND RITA REBUILDING EFFORTS

SEC. 401. There is hereby created a select committee on the model of the Truman Committee to investigate the awarding and carrying out of contracts to conduct military operations and relief and reconstruction activities related to the global war on terrorism (including all activities in Afghanistan and Iraq), and Hurricane Katrina recovery, relief, and reconstruction efforts (hereinafter referred to as the ''select committee'').

SEC. 402. (a) The select committee is to be composed of 19 Members of the House, one of whom shall be designated as chairman from the majority party and one of whom shall be designated ranking member from the minority party. The chairmen and ranking minority members of the following committees will serve on the select committee:

(1) Committee on Armed Services;

(2) Committee on Government Reform;

(3) Committee on Homeland Security; and

(4) Committee on International Relations.

The chairmen and ranking minority members of the following subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations will serve on the select committee:

(1) Subcommittee on Defense;

(2) Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs.

(3) Subcommittee on Homeland Security.

In addition, the Speaker shall appoint 5 members of the select committee, of which 2 members shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the minority leader. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the select committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(b) The select committee shall conduct an ongoing study and investigation of the awarding and carrying out of contracts by the Government for military operations and relief and reconstruction activities related to the global war on terrorism (including all activities in Afghanistan and Iraq), and Hurricane Katrina recovery, relief, and reconstruction efforts and make such recommendations to the House as the select committee deems appropriate regarding the following matters:

(1) Bidding, contracting, and auditing standards in the issuance of Government contracts;

(2) Oversight procedures;

(3) Forms of payment and safeguards against money laundering.

(4) Accountability of contractors and Government officials involved in procurement;

(5) Penalties for violations of law and abuses in the awarding and carrying out of Government contracts;

(6) Subcontracting under large, comprehensive contracts;

(7) Inclusion and utilization of small businesses, through subcontracts or otherwise.

(8) Such other matters as the select committee deems appropriate.

SEC. 403. (a) QUORUM.—One-third of the members of the select committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business except for the reporting of the results of its study and investigation (with its recommendations) or the authorization of subpoenas, which shall require a majority of the committee to be actually present, except that the select committee may designate a lesser number, but not less than two, as a quorum for the purpose of holding hearings to take testimony and receive evidence.

(b) POWERS.—For the purpose of carrying out this title, the select committee may sit and act during the present Congress at any time and place within the United States or elsewhere, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned and hold such hearings as it considers necessary and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, the furnishing of information by interrogatory, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, documents, and other things and information of any kind as it deems necessary, including relevant classified materials.

(c) ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENAS.—A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the select committee in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the chairman or by any member designated by the select committee, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman or such member. Subpoenas shall be issued under the seal of the House and attested by the Clerk. The select committee may request investigations, reports, and other assistance from any agency of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government.

(d) MEETINGS.—The chairman, or in his absence a member designated by the chairman, shall preside at all meetings and hearings of the select committee. All meetings and hearings of the select committee shall be conducted in open session, unless a majority of members of the select committee voting, there being in attendance the requisite number required for the purpose of hearings to take testimony, vote to close a meeting or hearing.

(e) APPLICABILITIES OF RULES OF THE HOUSE.—The Rules of the House of Representatives applicable to standing committees shall govern the select committee where not inconsistent with this title.

(f) WRITTEN COMMITTEE RULES.—The select committee shall adopt additional written rules, which shall be public, to govern its procedures, which shall not be inconsistent with this title or the Rules of the House of Representatives.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 15, 2006, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California, the chairman, reserves a point of order.

The gentlewoman from Ohio may proceed.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, my amendment, offered with its very able champion, Congressman JOHN TIERNEY of Massachusetts, will create a select House committee modeled on the Truman Commission created during World War II to exercise due diligence and proper congressional oversight on the over half a trillion dollars of expenditures by the government of the United States to conduct the global war on terrorism, as well as those contracts let for rebuilding of the gulf region after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

The original Truman Commission recouped over $15 billion to our taxpayers. That is big money in our time. But it was huge money back then, returned to our taxpayers from those interests that were conducting their business above and beyond the letter of the law.

We are asking for a thorough investigation of any waste, fraud and abuse in government contracts associated with the Iraq war and the global war on terrorism, as well as Katrina-Rita recovery and reconstruction.

Our amendment is responsible. It is a good government amendment. It provides real means for oversight that is thorough, not anecdotal.

Currently, no committee in this House has full investigative authority to probe growing public concerns about where our tax dollars are being spent in this contracting. The charges are legion of cost-plus contracts, contractor fraud, as contracts below $500,000 are purposely kept at that level to circumvent review. Criminal operatives like Rob Stein have been charged and arrested for manipulating Iraqi Coalition Provisional Authority accounts in bribery and kickback schemes, waste and abuse.

This administration is moving billions of dollars with no audit trails, even back to the Appropriations Committee, which should receive those audits. In Iraq, no-bid contracts of enormous proportions are let, like to Halliburton. In Iraq, rebuilding contracts, amounting to millions are missing. A few wrongdoers have been arrested, but they are just the tip of the iceberg. Companies like Custer Battles, given contracts to secure Baghdad Airport, is a company that never did security work. Indeed it submitted invoices for electricity that were only valued at $74,000, but they got $400,000. Broken trucks bought in local markets cost $228,000, yet Custer Battles billed for $800,000. In our Gulf region, no-bid contracts need Congressional oversight.

□ 1530

Over 10,000 manufactured houses sit on the ground in open fields in Hope, Arkansas, costing more than $300 million.

Our amendment aims to protect the taxpayer. It will save money. It will

save lives as we bring back inferior equipment that is discovered during this oversight.

This amendment will allow Congress to do its job, to oversee exactly how billions in taxpayer dollars are being spent in Iraq and our Gulf coast. The American people deserve this kind of responsible government.

It is critical that Congress curtail the opportunities for waste, fraud and abuse in future Federal contracting and bring those to task who are not meeting the letter and spirit of the law.

Mr. Chairman, I will be pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts and any remaining time I may have to himself as well as to Congressman WALTER JONES of North Carolina for their stellar work on this effort.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make mention, without repeating what the gentlewoman has said, this Government Reform Committee, the full committee in the House, has only had four hearings on Iraq contracting during this entire process.

In the other body, despite Senator LAUTENBERG's repeated requests, the Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs over there has not held a single hearing on this issue.

In the House Armed Services Committee, they have conducted oversight hearings on some issues related to military operations and protecting our troops, but they have not explored the issue of contracting since it was touched upon in June of 2004. That is quite a contrast with the original Truman Committee, which held 432 public hearings, 300 executive sessions, had 1,800 witnesses testify and issued 51 reports, all the while saving the taxpayer $15 billion and saving countless lives in the process.

The Truman Committee was unanimously respected for its focus on fact-finding and its refusal to succumb to partisan consideration, and that is what this commission would do as well. It is needed, because last week a Federal jury found two employees of Custer Battles had cheated the government on a contract to provide Iraq with new currency, and some $10 million in damages.

In December the Boston Globe reported that the Congressional Research Service put out a publication stating the Pentagon has not provided an overall reckoning of these funds by mission or by military operation. It went on to say that Congress has yet to receive a transparent accounting of money that is allocated so far for the war.

Kellogg, Brown & Root's employees last summer pleaded guilty of $100,000 in kick-backs, and it recently was reported that KBR did not do its job under the contract with purification of water for our troops, leaving them in a dangerous situation over there.

The General Accountability Office has purported to have found that the Department of Defense officials and Interior officials charged with overseeing the contract to provide interrogators at Abu Ghraib did not fully carry out their roles. And in March of 2005, we learned that the Pentagon auditors found that $212 million was paid to Kuwaiti and Turkish subcontractors for fuel and that overcharging was charged back by Halliburton.

We need this commission. It is the right thing to protect our troops and the storm victims. The American public deserves open and transparent government.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOLEY). The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentlewoman from Ohio's time has expired as well.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for the time. The reason I am on the floor, I am like anyone else in Congress. It is a privilege to serve in the United States House of Representatives. And every time I go home, like all other Members of Congress, and I see the people of the Third District of North Carolina, the home of Camp Lejeune, 60,000 retired military, they want to know why we are not doing a better job with oversight.

When you read in the papers that a DOD inspector says we cannot find $8 billion, and yet here we are in the Congress owing $8.2 trillion in debt, and the American people are out there working hard trying to do their best, they support our troops, they want us to support our troops.

But we have a responsibility, and that is to rebuild public trust. The public has lost faith in the Congress of meeting its responsibility for oversight. And I join the gentlewoman from Ohio and my other colleagues, and there are those on the Republican side too, that want to have an accountability to the American taxpayer.

It is time that we do so. So I ask my colleagues on both sides of the political aisle, for goodness sakes, let us support the American taxpayer. Let us do what Truman did, saying to the people during World War II, we are going to fight this war, and we are going to defeat the enemy, but we are going to do it in a wise way, we are going to protect the investment of the taxpayer.

Let's do the same thing in 2006 that he did during the 1940s. I thank the gentleman for this time, and I close by saying, let's do what is right. This is a good-government issue. It is time that we have accountability to the American people.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, with this bill, we will now have spent as much money in Iraq as we did in Vietnam. If you adjust for inflation, it is now just about the equivalent.

It seems to me that spending almost half a trillion dollars of the taxpayers' money is indefensible unless we are willing to see to it that that money is spent as well as we can possibly accomplish that fact.

I guess it boils down to this: if Members are happy with reading day after day about stories that are published about waste and fraud and ripoffs by contractors in Iraq, if they are tired of reading about the insider deals and the single-source contracts for work to be done in Iraq, if a Republican-controlled Congress cannot bring itself to conduct a really vigorous investigation of a Republican administration, then they ought to vote ''no.''

But if you think that we ought to be doing now exactly as we were doing in World War II, when Harry Truman conducted the kind of investigation the gentleman from Massachusetts mentioned, if you think we ought to replicate that effort, then you vote ''yes.''

I would submit that the Roosevelt administration was not damaged by the investigations done by the Truman Committee, they were strengthened by it, because that meant they had more resources available to get the job done in defeating the Japanese and defeating the Nazis.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts for the leadership that he has shown on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I urge an ''aye'' vote.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: an amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.

This amendment gives affirmative direction in effect.

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

Hearing none, the Chair finds that this amendment includes language imparting direction. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. NADLER:

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

SEC. ___. REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO ENTRY OF OCEAN SHIPPING CONTAINERS INTO THE UNITED STATES.

(a) REQUIREMENTS.—Section 70116 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO ENTRY OF OCEAN SHIPPING CONTAINERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An ocean shipping container may enter the United States, either directly or via a foreign port, only if—

''(A) the container is scanned with equipment that meets the standards established

pursuant to paragraph (2)(A) and a copy of the scan is provided to the Secretary, and

''(B) the container is secured with a seal that meets the standards established pursuant to paragraph (2)(B),

before the container is loaded on the vessel for shipment to the United States.

''(2) STANDARDS FOR SCANNING EQUIPMENT AND SEALS.—

''(A) SCANNING EQUIPMENT.—The Secretary shall establish standards for scanning equipment required to be used under paragraph (1)(A) to ensure that such equipment uses the best-available technology, including technology to scan a container for radiation and density and, if appropriate, for atomic elements.

''(B) SEALS.—The Secretary shall establish standards for seals required to be used under paragraph (1)(B) to ensure that such seals use the best-available technology, including technology to—

''(i) detect any breach into a container;

''(ii) identify the time and place of such breach;

''(iii) notify the Secretary of such breach before the container enters the Exclusive Economic Zone of the United States; and

''(iv) track the time and location of the container during transit to the United States, including by truck, rail, or vessel.

''(C) REVIEW AND REVISION.—The Secretary shall review and, if necessary, revise the standards established pursuant to subparagraphs (A) and (B) not less than once every two years.

''(D) DEFINITION.—In subparagraph (B), the term 'Exclusive Economic Zone of the United States' has the meaning given the term 'Exclusive Economic Zone' in section 2101(10a) of this title.''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 70116(c) of title 46, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) of this section, such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2007 and each subsequent fiscal year.

(c) REGULATIONS; EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) REGULATIONS.—

(A) INTERIM FINAL RULE.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall issue an interim final rule as a temporary regulation to implement section 70116(c) of title 46, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) of this section, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section, without regard to the provisions of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code.

(B) FINAL RULE.—The Secretary shall issue a final rule as a permanent regulation to implement section 70116(c) of title 46, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) of this section, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section, in accordance with the provisions of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code. The final rule issued pursuant to that rulemaking may supersede the interim final rule issued pursuant to subparagraph (A).

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The requirements of section 70116(c) of title 46, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) of this section, apply with respect to any ocean shipping container entering the United States, either directly or via a foreign port, beginning one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 15, 2006, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to attach to this bill, the Sail Only If Scanned Act, the SOS Act. This act was developed by me and Mr. OBERSTAR, with the support of Minority Leader PELOSI, to address the issue of shipping container security.

This amendment would require that every shipping container be scanned with the most modern technology and sealed with a tamper-proof seal before it is placed on a ship bound for the United States so that we can have absolute assurances that no nuclear weapons or radiological bombs are being brought into our ports.

Only 1 percent of the more than 11 million shipping containers destined for the United States are scanned before they are loaded on a ship overseas. This is unacceptable.

The United States cannot own or control the entire global trade network, but we can and should ensure the security of every single container destined for this country. The controversy over the proposed Dubai Ports World deal has woken up the American people and made them think about how critical our ports are for national security. But who owns the ports and who operates the ports, while important, is far less important than what comes into the ports.

Ninety-five percent of all of the 11 million, 40-foot boxes that come into our ports are uninspected, not scanned. Not scanned by x-rays, not examined for radioactivity before they get here. Any one of them could have an atomic bomb or radiological bomb. That is unacceptable.

If there is a bomb inside a container, it is too late to discover that in Newark or Miami or Los Angeles. Reading the manifest is not enough. Having shipments only from low-risk shippers is not enough, because any one container could have a catastrophic bomb inside it.

My amendment is quite simple. It would require that all containers must be scanned using the best available technology, including scanning for radiation and density before they are loaded on a ship bound for the United States.

The scans must be submitted to U.S. Government officials for review before the container is loaded, and the containers must be sealed with a device that indicates if the container is tampered with in transit, and automatically notifies U.S. officials of any breach before the containers come within a few hundred miles of the United States.

Steve Flynn of the Council of Foreign Relations and a port security expert wrote in the New York Times a few days ago: ''This is not a pie-in-the-sky idea. Since January 2005, every single container entering the truck gates of two of the world's busiest container terminals in Hong Kong has passed through scanning and radiation detection devices. Images of the containers' contents are then stored on computers so they can be scrutinized by American or other customs authorities almost in real-time. Customs inspectors can then issue orders not to load a container that worries them. The Department of Homeland Security has greeted this private sector initiative with only tepid interest.''

Mr. Chairman, we cannot simply stand by while the Bush administration twiddles its thumbs and fails to secure the movement of containers before they reach the United States. The terminal operations in Hong Kong prove we can scan 100 percent of the containers without disrupting the economy or the flow of goods. The cost to scan a container is $6.50.

The entire cost to amortize all of the equipment is $20 a container. Given that it costs $4,000 to ship a container across the Pacific if there is between 50 and $500,000 worth of merchandise in each container, a $20 cost is trivial.

Congress needs to make 100 percent scanning the policy of the United States. This amendment would do that. I realize, Mr. Chairman, this amendment may not be allowed under the rules of the House.

I fully expect the Republicans to raise a point of order against it. I would note, however, that the underlying bill includes a provision blocking the proposed takeover of U.S. terminals by Dubai Ports World. I support that provision.

But if we can include language on the Dubai deal in this bill, then certainly the Republican majority should allow us to include language that secures shipping containers and prevents atomic bombs from going off in port cities.

At the very least, they could easily waive the rule and allow a vote on this amendment. If they care more about these rules that they waive every day than they do about protecting the American public from nuclear bombs and shipping containers, I truly fear for our safety.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment to attach the Sail Only if Scanned Act, the SOS Act, to this bill. The only way we will adequately protect our citizens is if the Republicans in Congress join with us to force the Bush administration to take seriously the issue of container security and make sure that every single container is scanned and sealed with a tamper-proof seal before being placed on a ship bound for the United States.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: an amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.

This amendment directly amends existing law.

□ 1545

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOLEY). Does any Member wish to speak on the point of order?

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations raises a point of order that this legislates on an appropriations bill. And it might.

But I would challenge the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the Republican majority, if you are going to insist on a technical interpretation of the rule on this amendment, I would challenge the Republicans to allow this bill to the floor for a vote or allow this bill as an amendment on some other bill. Because to fail to do that, to insist on a technical reading of this rule, and not allow this or something like it on the floor, is to jeopardize the lives of every single American for a trivial cost. And I urge that the Republicans allow, we have been trying some version of this for 3 years now. We have never been able to get a vote. But the safety of the American people is at risk if we allow 11 million shipping containers, 40-foot boxes into the ports of our country without scanning them, and knowing only what someone says is in them, not what is really in them.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The Chair finds that this amendment directly does amend existing law. The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WAXMAN:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be obligated or expended by the Secretary of the Army or his designee to award a contract to any contractor if the Defense Contract Audit Agency has determined that more than $100,000,000 of the contractor's costs for contracts involving work in Iraq under one or more Army contracts were unreasonable.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 15, 2006, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognize the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Three years ago, Congress and the American people were told that the Iraq War would be quick and inexpensive. Senior administration officials told us that rebuilding Iraq would cost less than $2 billion. And we were told that Iraq would be able to finance its own reconstruction with its oil revenues.

Well, 3 years later, we know that these assurances were completely unfounded. The war has cost hundreds of billions of dollars. We squandered over $20 billion on reconstruction projects that have left basic services below prewar levels. And these massive costs have contributed to record budget deficits at home.

There are multiple causes for the enormous burden placed on the taxpayer. President Bush and his advisors grossly underestimate the insurgency. They failed to engage our allies in the rebuilding effort, and they vastly overestimated the amount of oil Iraq could sell to funds its reconstruction.

The amendment I am offering with Mr. DINGELL addresses part of the problem, rampant waste, fraud and abuse in Federal contracting under the Bush administration. The largest contractor operating in Iraq is Halliburton. Government auditors have repeatedly caught Halliburton red-handed. They have found over a billion dollars in unreasonable and unsupported charges.

Let me repeat this. Federal auditors have found Halliburton's unreasonable and unsupported bills exceed $1 billion. Yet over and over again, this administration has ignored its own auditors. The Pentagon's auditors have found over $260 million in unreasonable and unsupported costs when they examine Halliburton's no-bid contract to restore Iraq's oil field.

Independent industry experts call Halliburton's charges ''highway robbery.'' But as this chart shows, the Bush administration ignored these findings and paid Halliburton for 97 percent of its overcharges and then gave Halliburton millions in additional bonuses. These same Pentagon auditors rejected $200 million in dining hall expenses because Halliburton charged for meals it never served to the troops. But the Bush administration ignored the auditors and paid 75 percent of the challenged costs and tripled Halliburton's profit on the contract.

The auditors got so frustrated with Halliburton that they warned Pentagon officials not to enter into any more contracts with the company. But 3 days later, the Bush administration gave Halliburton a new $1.2 billion contract in Iraq. And these are not the only problems.

More than 50 cases of contract fraud in Iraq are currently under investigation. And administration officials cannot account for over $8 billion in Iraqi oil proceeds. This kind of incompetent and egregious mismanagement is hard to believe. No matter how many times they bilk the taxpayer, politically favored companies keep getting more and more Federal contracts.

The administration has a duty to safeguard taxpayer dollars, but it is shirking that responsibility. We need to pass this amendment to end this costly cycle.

This is an amendment that is very simple. It will prohibit the administration from using the funds in this bill to award new contracts to any company that has overcharged the government by $100 million or more in Iraq.

This is just common sense. No company that squanders over $100 million of taxpayers money should be rewarded with new contracts. If the administration will not protect the taxpayer against waste, fraud and abuse, the Congress must act. For the sake of the taxpayers and the troops, I urge support for this amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, on the surface of this amendment, it is sort of interesting, because none of us want to see any money wasted or any money spent improperly. The problem that we have here, Mr. Chairman, is that we just got a copy of this amendment late last night and other Members only got it this morning. This could have very far reaching effects, not only on future contracts, but on existing contracts. And I would hate to see the logistical flow of supplies to our troops in the field interrupted because of this amendment.

Frankly, I was tempted to accept the amendment, but having thought about it, we just really have not had time to know exactly what the effect is going to be. So I rise to oppose the amendment and I would be happy to work with the gentleman as we proceed through this bill or the regular defense bill to try to work with him to accomplish what he wants, but we need to know what it is that this amendment does and it is a little bit complicated.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure you we were very careful in drafting this amendment. It is prospective. It would not affect the funding of existing contracts for troop support. They will continue untouched. The amendment simply says we will not reward companies with new contracts after they overcharge the taxpayers by $100 million. I hope that will allay the gentleman's concerns.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comments, but it is important that the defense committees know for a fact as opposed to the debate on the floor. So we have got to oppose the amendment at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. This is

aimed at the company Halliburton. That is very clear.

The papers are awash with Halliburton and have been for several years. Halliburton employs lots of Americans. And I do not have the exact number of KIA, but they, like our soldiers in the field, the people that drive those trucks and work those logistics to support our Marines out in the western area of operations out in Fallujah and our Army personnel out in Mosul and Tikrit and other remote parts of Iraq, those people risk their lives every day.

I will say to the gentleman, as I recall, over 20 of them have been killed in action, people like the Halliburton drivers. People have been captured by the enemy and some of them held hostage, unable to escape. Most of the people, the vast majority of the people that work for this contractor, like lots of contractors that support our American military overseas, are good, hardworking people. And if you look, if you go up and eat with the Stryker brigades up in Mosul, or the 101st in Tikrit or the Marines in Fallujah, and you go into their mess halls and you look at the operation and you see the fuel that is delivered, you see the ammunition that is delivered, you see the treatment, the quality of life for our military people, you will understand then that is primarily a result of American corporations which support the war effort. And that is a fact of life.

Now, the idea that prices have been unreasonable and that there are contracts where they have abused the American taxpayer or abused the contract process, let us take that under the regular order. And if that is true, let's hold people accountable. Let's hold the corporation accountable. But the idea that we single out a group of people which is thousands and thousands of Americans who support our fighting personnel and basically paralyze that operation is unreasonable.

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

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

We have been working on this investigation about Halliburton for years, and we have written letters asking for hearings over and over again. The committee has not held a hearing on these overcharges. I do not know why the Armed Services Committee has not held a hearing on it, but it sounds to me a bit disingenuous when they say we have not had a chance to look at this matter.

I support hardworking people on the ground that are working for Halliburton and other private contractors, but I do not think they would support the idea of their own corporate CEOs and shareholders getting rich unfairly for charges that are not reasonable. That is what this amendment is all about.

So it seems to me that it rings a bit false when we hear these kind of arguments against the amendment. Oh, we have not looked at it. Why haven't they looked at it? Oh, it might affect people serving the troops now. Well, that is just absolutely untrue.

So I continue to urge support for the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman I thank the gentleman for yielding me time. I rise in support of the Waxman-Dingell amendment which is about waste, fraud and abuse. That is it. And this is the full extent of the amendment, eight lines, very simple.

All it says is that none of the funds appropriated or made available by this Act shall be obligated or expended by the Secretary of the Army to any contractor if the Defense Contract Audit Agency has determined that more than $100 million of the contractor's costs for contracts involving work in Iraq under one or more Army contracts were unreasonable.

So we have set up a process to get rid of waste, fraud and abuse. How long does it take to figure that out?

I cannot imagine that anybody in this body wants to fund waste, fraud and abuse, particularly in excess of $100 million. That is what this is about.

Last June, Congressman WAXMAN released a report documenting a stunning $1.4 billion in questioned and unsupported charges by Halliburton in Iraq. Don't we want to know about that?

Last month, The New York Times reported that the Bush administration ignored 97 percent of the recommendations made by Pentagon auditors and awarded Halliburton over $250 million under its Iraq oil contract. And just last week, a Federal jury found that another firm, Custer Battles, defrauded the government by millions of dollars under just one of its Iraq contracts.

□ 1600

So how does this Congress justify ignoring blatant stealing? Do we not all want to get at that? I mean, too many of our soldiers have been asked to do without proper body armor and equipment, and they come home to reduced benefits, and this Congress has found it easy enough to say no to our soldiers; and yet every single time we have been able to say yes to Halliburton.

Is it not time that all of us agree that it is wrong to have this kind of waste, fraud and abuse and to pass this simple amendment?

I urge a ''yes'' vote.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

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

Let me just say to my colleagues here who have stated that we should hold up our contracts and not give new contracts until past contracts are found to be reasonable versus unreasonable, Members have stood on this floor and have called every weapons system since the first Persian tank unreasonable in cost. The B–2 has been called unreasonable. Every ship in the navy has been called unreasonable in the cost. Every fighter aircraft has been called unreasonable in the cost.

The idea that you are not going to have any action on these contracts unless you have a congressional hearing is not true. There is no committee here that has the ability to enforce or not enforce a contract. You have dozens, in fact hundreds, of government lawyers who have every opportunity, indeed have the charge, of going through complex contracts, and where they find that the contract was violated by the contractor, and there are lots of contractors around who are bankrupt to attest to this, that that contract is then acted upon, damages are extracted; and all these are things that we have put in our system of laws.

Now, the idea that you are going to take a major part of the support of an ongoing shooting war and you are going to paralyze it and say, well, it is only for present contracts, the next one that comes up next month, that is going to be different, but you are going to allow present contracts to continue. That could mean that you have got a hiatus in capability, a hiatus in the expertise of these people who have gone out, wearing the uniform of American contractors, put themselves in harm's way and, over the last several years in this war, developed a real expertise.

So I know the gentleman's amendment may play well politically in some quarters, but I think it is bad for the men and women who wear the uniform of the United States because the contractors we are talking about are the people supporting them right now in Iraq and Afghanistan.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, says that reasonableness is something that could be subjective. Some people think that certain weapons systems may not be reasonable. Well, reasonableness is not some vague standard we picked out of the air. It comes directly from section 31.201–3(a) of the Defense Contract Audit Agency's ''Contract Audit Manual.'' That provision reads: ''A cost is reasonable if, in its nature and amount, it does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person in the conduct of competitive business.''

Every government auditor knows this standard. It is a standard that the Pentagon's own auditors apply to Halliburton. It is the standard that was flouted by the Bush administration, and it is the standard that my amendment would reaffirm.

Now, this last argument, Halliburton's got an expertise and, therefore, they should get future contracts

because we may not be able to find someone else with the expertise, and, therefore, we should ignore overcharges, unreasonable charges in excess of $100 million dollar in the past, that is an incredible argument. No matter how many times we may be the victims, or our taxpayers may be the victims, of waste, fraud and abuse, we should continue to pay? That is absurd.

Now, I just submit that we are following the very clear standard in the law, and our amendment does not plow any new ground, and I would urge support for the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

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

One thing my distinguished friend from California (Mr. WAXMAN) has not shown us is how American laws, existing laws in contract, that govern the acquisition of systems and the acquisition of services, how those laws are not applicable to this American corporation, and so, therefore, we have to say, stop, we are not going to do anymore business with this corporation.

In fact, all the laws that go toward the enforcement of contracts and the contract itself, of course, are enforceable. Fines can be extracted. Other remedies can be extracted; and if there is, in fact, fraud, and I have heard the term ''fraud'' used in this debate, if there is fraud, that is a crime in contracting. If you commit crime in contracting, you can go to jail. There is no Member of this Chamber who, if a contract is broken between the United States Government and any of our contractors over there, there is no one in this Chamber who is going to say that we should not extract our full remedy under the laws we create and if people are involved in criminal action that they should not be prosecuted.

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

Mr. Chairman, $40 for a case of soda, $100 for a bag of laundry, torching an $80,000 truck instead of replacing flat tires, charging 40 times more to transport fuel than reasonable, these are some of the things that Halliburton has been called to task for, not by Democrats, but by the auditors, the professional auditors at the Department of Defense; and they should have been penalized for doing that.

Now, what was, was; but let's don't in the future give them contracts to abuse us again.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), the very distinguished ranking member on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I am nervous about the amendment. I am nervous because I am not sure, when we have got people out there making contracts for the troops out in the field, there is no question all of us want to take care of the fraud and abuse, all of us. Nobody's done more of a job than you have, the gentleman from California; but I get nervous when we are doing something prospectively. We are not sure of the impact.

I think we would have to change this in conference anyway because we just do not know enough about the impact. You assure us. They are worried about it. So I am very worried about this amendment. I think we would be better off letting the system take care of it. I think when you have fraud and abuse, it has got to be taken care of.

The Congress has the oversight responsibility, but I am not sure legislating for the future is going to solve the problem. That is the thing that worries me.

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

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, the system has failed because the Bush administration paid 97 percent of the charges that the Pentagon auditors found to be unreasonable. So our amendment is structured to apply in the future.

We will have a chance to continue to look at this. I feel comfortable that this is not going to jeopardize anything that is going on in Iraq today and certainly not the existing contracts such as the ongoing logistical contract which Halliburton still has; but for the future, if any company has overcharged by $100 million, we should not be rushing out there and giving them a new contract.

Existing contracts are existing contracts. They should not be rewarded for that overcharging.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I just worry when we do something like this prospectively, we might affect what is going on in the field. None of us want to stop a contract for services to the troops in the field right now, and I think you agree with that.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I respect that. I agree with you. That is why we were very careful in the way we drafted this amendment.

Mr. MURTHA. I know you believe that, but I would err on the side of trying to prevent it. So at this point I would be against the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

I would like to say that this is not about a particular company. This is about a policy change, a policy change that we have not had any opportunity to review, with no hearings. We only learned about this amendment late last night, and it is a policy that should not be changed here on the floor without the benefit of some backup hearings and actual review.

Like I said, it sounds like a good idea; but we have just got to be sure. We do not want to interrupt the logistical flow of what our troops need to carry out their mission. There is a major mission under way in Iraq as we speak, Operation Swarmer, and it is the biggest air operation since the war started. We cannot afford to upset an ongoing operation like that.

We have got to support our troops, and if a policy change like this has a negative effect, that is just not good. It is not good for our troops. So I would hope we would oppose this amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to deny further awards of contracts to contractors that have been found by the Defense auditors to have billed the government for more than $100 million in unreasonable costs.

From the moment Representative WAXMAN and I learned about secret no-bid contracts given to large companies like Halliburton in 2003, for activities in Iraq, we have tried to get the facts on the matter. And it has not been easy to get those facts.

In the course of our investigation, with the help of the Government Accountability Office, we have learned of some pretty terrible things. First, we found that Halliburton was importing oil into Iraq at extremely high prices. We were particularly concerned about the company's decision to import gasoline from Kuwait at a price far above market levels.

Eventually, Defense auditors agreed and found that there were $263 million in unsupported and questioned costs in these contracts. Yet last month, the Corps of Engineers ignored their auditors and reimbursed Halliburton for $254 million—all but $9 million of the questioned costs.

This follows a pattern with Halliburton. The Defense auditors had previously questioned $200 million in costs for meal services provided by the company, which again was overruled by the Army, which gave the company $145 million.

This amendment to deny new contracts to companies that have a history of billing the government for questionable costs is hardly novel. In January, 2004, the Defense Contract Audit Agency itself recommended that the Corps not enter into new contracts with Halliburton, but 3 three days later the Army awarded Halliburton a new $1.2 billion contract.

The amendment before us will ensure that taxpayer money will go to support the troops and help rebuild infrastructure and not fatten the pockets of contractors that have a history of questionable billing practices. I emphasize this amendment will not take any funds away from troop support, but will help support the troops.

It is an embarrassment that there have been virtually no Congressional hearings on the matter. Instead, we must act legislatively.

The best course of action to ensure that our money is going where it is needed in support of the troops is to put an end to future contracts with companies that are serial overchargers. Vote for this amendment.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

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

SEC. ____. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enforce a deadline described in subsection (b) under section 7(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)).

(b) Subsection (a) applies to any of the following deadlines:

(1) The deadline of April 10, 2006, for physical loan applications and the deadline of May 29, 2006, for economic injury disaster loan applications, as noticed by the Small Business Administration for Major Disaster Declaration numbers 1603 and 1604.

(2) The deadline of March 11, 2006, for physical loan applications and the deadline of May 29, 2006, for economic injury disaster loan applications, as noticed by the Small Business Administration for Major Disaster Declaration number 1605.

(3) The deadline of April 10, 2006, for physical loan applications and the deadline of June 26, 2006, for economic injury disaster loan applications, as noticed by the Small Business Administration for Major Disaster Declaration numbers 1606 and 1607.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 15, 2006, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

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

As we all know, the recovery process in the gulf area continues to be ongoing. Victims are still digging out from debris, and many are unable to even get back to their homes and businesses. Unfortunately, these problems have been compounded by the failure of the SBA to provide disaster assistance to these victims.

I offer this amendment today to ensure that the thousands of homes and business owners in the gulf area are not unfairly denied the opportunity to file for a disaster loan. This amendment will give the victims of the hurricanes in the gulf the time they need to assess their situation and make informed decisions about applying for disaster loans.

Without this change, the SBA, by imposing an arbitrary deadline, will create additional and unnecessary hardships on a group of people who have already suffered enough.

The SBA's failures are clearly documented. In response to the hurricanes in the gulf, the SBA issued 2.1 million applications to businesses, homeowners and individuals seeking financial assistance. As of just a few weeks ago, only 400,000 of these applications have been submitted to the SBA for processing. The balance of the applications, 1.7 million, or 80 percent, remain outstanding.

The reasons for these low return rates are plentiful. SBA has failed to supply the necessary assistance to fill out the massive application forms. Potential applicants are being incorrectly told that they are not eligible. On top of this, SBA has also failed to implement an outreach plan in communities to make eligible applicants aware of this program.

Rather than recognizing these problems, the SBA has set March 11 and April 10 application deadlines for physical injury loans, which are the main source of assistance for homes and businesses with physical damage. If these deadlines are maintained, it would have the effect of leaving many potential applicants without the ability to secure Federal financial assistance.

This amendment will make sure that SBA stays in the gulf until the job is done.

The failures of the SBA have already created unnecessary hardship and frustration in the gulf region. SBA has declined an unprecedented 65 percent of loans. The agency has a backlog of over 60,000 loans. SBA has a processing time of 80 days, nearly triple the normal time. All of these issues have created confusion and consternation among residents.

By voting for this amendment, we will make sure the victims of this disaster are not punished for the failures of our Federal Government. We cannot turn our back on these victims.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this amendment.

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

□ 1615

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

The chairman of the Small Business Committee opposes this amendment, the chairman of the authorizing committee. This amendment keeps the application period for SBA disaster loans open indefinitely. This could expose the disaster loan program to waste, fraud, and abuse that would virtually be impossible for the SBA to accurately verify losses as more time elapses from when the hurricanes struck the gulf coast.

This amendment is also unnecessary because the administration has already had the ability to extend the application deadline, and has done so three times. So if they have the ability to do it, and they have done it, and they have done it three times, and your authorizing chairman would oppose it, why would you want to do it? In fact, the deadline was just extended for another 30 days, to April 10, for Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

So, if there was a need, the administration would do it again. If the gentlewoman wants to change the parameters of the disaster loans, she should work within her position and with the ranking member and come up with something that everyone could agree on.

In the interest of time, I would just say that I oppose the amendment. It can lead to a lot of problems.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Let me just say that SBA, before we start talking about deadlines, we need to get SBA to process the 60,000 applications that are in backlog. They need to do a better job in educating people so that we can get more than 19 percent of the applications back.

They need to fix the system where they have been declining 60 percent of all the loans that have been submitted to SBA. They need to do the job before they pull out, and that is an excuse for them not to do the job.

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

Mr. WOLF. The administration has extended this several times.

Secondly, the gentlewoman seems to constantly be criticizing SBA at every turn. We are going to ask the National Academy for Public Administration, somebody, to find truth out here and then begin. If you constantly browbeat and it is not accurate, you should be careful when you say things, because words mean things.

The chairman was before our committee yesterday. And so what we are going to do is, we are going to ask the National Academy of Public Administration to take a look at all these charges that go back and forth, because if we are constantly attacking Federal employees in program after program after program, I mean words matter. We just can't use this institution to attack people.

This place has turned into a partisan pit and it is time to bring some objectivity. So what we are going to do, we are going to take all of your charges, all of your comments, all of your complaints, all of your criticisms, all your condemnations and ask the National Academy of Public Administration to look at it to find out some truth.

This is a bad amendment. You are on the authorizing committee. You could do it. If we are going to do everything here, why do we even need an authorizing committee?

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). The gentlewoman has 90 seconds.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Well, let me just say this. Isn't it true that there are 60,000 applications in backlog? Isn't it true that 19 percent, only 19 percent have been processed? Isn't it true that there is 65 percent declined on loans approval?

This is not about partisanship, this is about victims who are suffering, who are losing their businesses, who are losing their jobs. This is what this amendment is all about.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, do I have the right to close?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. WOLF. Then I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, in a hearing yesterday on the disaster loan program, we heard two different stories on this equation in the gulf. We heard from the SBA administrator who said that everything is great. He told the committee that they are processing record numbers of loans and that there are virtually no problems. At the same time, we have a small business owner, Patricia Smith, who came in from New Orleans and told her story.

She told the committee how she could not find a Federal official to help her apply for a loan and how she spent hours working through paperwork. She told us that it took months to hear back on the status of her loan and that she was wrongly denied. The woman also shared that there are thousands out there with the same story.

The view from Washington, and what is actually going on in the gulf coast region is very different. By extending the deadline for disaster loans, we will give victims the ability to assess their situation and make an informed decision about getting an SBA loan.

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

Mr. WOLF. How much time do I have, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. WOLF. Several years ago, you said if we abolished the loan guarantees, the world would come to an end. We abolished them, and now the number of loans are up. They are at a record number.

So what we are going to do, and I think the body should know, we want the SBA to work well, we want them to make the loans, but if we are constantly hammering and criticizing and condemning and governing by press release we don't get very far. So what we are going to do is we are going to ask the National Academy of Public Administration, a nonpartisan group, to come in and look at the gentlewoman's charges and all these things and come back and give us an honest report so we will know. But if we are just harassing Federal employees and criticizing them at every step of the way, we really don't accomplish very much.

And I would say that you did say, and I will submit for the record what you said about abolishing the loan guarantees, but by doing that, we saved the taxpayer about $170 million. The loans are up. That was basically a subsidy for the bankers. The banking lobby wanted that and we took it away and now we saved the taxpayers money.

This is a bad amendment. Vote it down.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

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 make or guarantee a loan under section 7(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)) other than a loan for which the borrower is charged an interest rate in accordance with section 7(c)(5) of such Act, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 15, 2006, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, while the House will begin debating the budget resolution in the coming weeks, this amendment offers the first vote on one of the initiatives introduced in the President's 2007 budget. This amendments provides Members the opportunity to send a clear message that victims of disasters should not be subject to additional and unnecessary burdens by the Federal Government.

Buried in the President's budget submission was a proposal to raise the interest rates on SBA's disaster loans. This initiative will eliminate the current caps on interest rates and allow for the SBA to charge higher rates on disaster loans. This could mean that interest rates go up by as much as 50 percent.

The end result will force those who had their homes or businesses destroyed to pay for our budget problems here in Washington. I offer this amendment today to ensure that we stop this wrongheaded proposal in its tracks. It puts Congress on record making it clear that an attempt to create additional hardships on disaster victims will not be tolerated.

Given all the missteps by FEMA and SBA in the gulf, Congress should not be adding to the problems of those hit by a natural disaster. Findings by the General Accounting Office, various inspector generals and congressional panels have revealed the numerous ways the Federal Government has failed our citizens in the gulf. By supporting this amendment, Congress will be saying that we stand together in these difficult times.

I am a firm believer in balancing our spending priorities, but this proposal is beyond the pale. I find it hard to believe, particularly given all the wasteful spending in Washington, that the only place to find funding is on the backs of disaster victims. Whatever happened to compassionate conservatism?

The effect of the administration's proposal will mean increased costs by thousands of dollars for disaster victims. It is alarming that despite all the problems with the management of the disaster loan program the only change the President offered in his budget was to increase the cost on disaster victims.

We agree that changes need to be made to the disaster loan program, but this is not one of them. By voting for this amendment, Congress expresses its commitment to rejecting this bad idea. I urge a ''yes'' vote on this amendment.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This amendment has absolutely, positively, categorically nothing to do with an emergency supplemental bill that we are considering today. It is an attempt to stop a legislative proposal related to the fiscal year 2007 budget, which, as an authorizer, you will get to have that opportunity. And it will come out on the floor one way or the other, and the Congress will have the opportunity to vote on it.

The proposal will have to be considered by the committee. SBA cannot unilaterally make the changes. So the Congress should know that the authorizers in the Congress set the rate. It is not the administration. So we are going to have that opportunity when Mr. MANZULLO and the members, minority and majority, make it.

Lastly, it is not necessary and it will have no effect, because it is just simply an attempt to prejudge a proposal by the administration for next fiscal year, and that is not something that you would do in a supplemental. If you would do that in a supplemental bill, we should just abolish every other bill and put everything in a supplemental bill, because then everything is a supplemental.

So it is a bad amendment, and I urge you to vote ''no.''

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

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

I would simply note, given what the gentleman just said, that is exactly what we have done with Iraq. Every dollar of the Iraq war has been financed through a supplemental appropriation. That is the way the administration has been able to hide from the taxpayers the full long-term cost of this war. That is the way they have been able to avoid systematic oversight. They put it in a supplemental, and then it is a must-pass, hurry-up, piece-at-a-time operation. Eventually you get the whole pie, but you get it in pieces, and the public doesn't know what the total picture is.

So I would simply say that I was kind of amused by that comment because the administration is way ahead of all of us. They decided a long time ago that they are going to supplemental the Congress to death, and they put every possible dollar they can into supplementals. They have yet to spend $1 in a regular defense appropriation bill for Iraq.

So I just find it interesting that one person is expected to live up to a standard that the administration itself won't live up to.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Let me just say that this is a cornerstone of the President's budget for SBA, and I think it is important that Congress go on record on this issue, particularly for us Democrats. And what we are saying today is, it is a bad idea, and we need to make it clear from the beginning, from the start, that we want to balance the budget but not at the expense of disaster victims.

And that is exactly what we are doing with this amendment today. We must prevent any of these funds from being used for higher interest loans in disaster loans for victims. We have to make sure that if money is carried over, that it will not be used for higher interest loans that will impact disaster victims.

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

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman has 1½ minutes.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would ensure that the disaster loan program remains an affordable source of capital for those affected by future disasters. When the program works, it has served to create the public-private partnership that balances the needs of fiscal constraint and compassion for our fellow Americans.

The administration's proposal to raise interest rates on disaster loans will simply leave the victims to fend for themselves.

□ 1630

In the end, it is in our best economic interest to get these communities back up and running and creating the jobs they have proven they can create. By voting ''yes,'' we are telling the administration that raising interest rates on disaster loans is a bad idea and Congress will not support it. I urge a ''yes'' vote.

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

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

We would like to work with your staff and have our staff sit down so we can ask NAPA questions that you think are important, issues like this and other issues. What we want to do is work with you, get the National Academy of Public Administration to answer these questions and so we can find out one way or the other. Would that be appropriate?

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to do that; but I have to tell you, victims in the gulf region cannot wait until we have such a discussion, and that is why this amendment is important to be voted on today.

Mr. WOLF. But if there is something wrong with regard to the SBA, I think it is important to find that out and identify that with Mr. MANZULLO and ask any questions you want to have NAPA answer so we can put it together and finally get to the bottom.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. LEE:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to implement, administer, or enforce the termination of the hotel and motel emergency sheltering program established by FEMA for families displaced by Hurricane Katrina and other hurricanes of the 2005 season.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 15, 2006, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

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

This amendment is very simple. This amendment would prevent FEMA from evicting from hotels and motels the thousands of families who were affected by the hurricanes on the gulf coast last summer.

Mr. Chairman, 6 months ago, the entire world watched the wealthiest, most powerful country on Earth turn its back on those who couldn't afford to evacuate their homes in advance and during the hurricanes. People were left to fend for themselves on rooftops, trying to save their lives and the lives of their families.

We cannot sweep under the rug the faces and the images of those who were disproportionately abandoned by their government. Unfortunately, today, 6 months after the storm, the majority of these people are still fending for themselves. The people of New Orleans and the gulf coast have experienced more tragedy and more suffering in the last 6 months than anyone should have to face in a lifetime. It is bad enough that they suffered through one of the worst natural disasters in the history of United States, it is bad enough that they lost their homes and their jobs and their livelihoods, it is bad enough that they are suffering mental breakdowns, high suicide rates and high rates of post-dramatic stress. And it is bad enough the insurance companies are trying to dodge their obligations to pay out claims to property owners.

But now to add insult to injury, yesterday their own government, our government, ended payments for hotel and motel rooms for thousands of displaced Katrina evacuees. Where will all of these people go? We already have a huge homeless population in this country. Why are we creating a new generation of Katrina homeless?

This lacks morality and is about as low as you can go. What benefit does the Federal Government have in kicking people when they are down?

Today, the newspapers are filled with accounts of people who were kicked out of their rooms and have no place to go. There are reports of families piling their possessions out of hotels and motels and into trucks, but with nowhere to go. This is just disgraceful. What kind of a message do we send with these evictions? What do we say to the rest of the world? What does it say about our values and our priorities and really what we believe in terms of putting people first?

I believe we have to send a different message, and we can do that today. We

have to reject the actions of FEMA and this administration and prevent people from getting kicked out of their hotel and motel rooms.

By passing my amendment, we would block FEMA from using any money in this bill to evict people living in hotels and motels as a result of Hurricane Katrina. We should not allow FEMA to dump people on the streets. That is just plain wrong. That is all it is, it is wrong. That should not be done. This is unjust.

Let us help at least stabilize their lives and give them a safe place to sleep without worrying about being on the streets. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to this amendment which would prohibit FEMA from terminating its hotel and motel emergency sheltering program. This language is overly restrictive. At its peak, FEMA had more than 85,000 hotel rooms rented per night. The current subsidized hotel-room population is 3,780 households with the vast majority being in Louisiana.

FEMA is now in the process of transitioning these remaining hotel/motel residents into more appropriate housing. We do not want families living in motels. We all want to see those families in a better environment, longer term housing solutions such as apartments and the like.

This transition will occur over the coming weeks. To date, over 2,500 have already been matched up against not-yet-ready temporary housing, trailers, apartments and the like. The remainders include hard-to-place individuals, the disabled and people like that; and FEMA will continue to provide hotel/motel assistance to those people until a suitable temporary housing solution is identified and prepared.

Members should be assured that people are not being thrown out in the streets. FEMA is working with families to place them in appropriate housing solutions. This amendment would keep in place a program in the long term that is not good for the recipients or anyone else. So I urge Members to vote against the amendment.

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), who is a real leader and was down there helping people save their lives during this tragedy.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I simply wanted to come down here and support the gentlewoman's amendment because yesterday 4,007 codes expired. We do not know where those people are. We do not know if they have housing. As a matter of fact, there are news reports this morning that are telling us there are people who have nowhere to go.

I thank the gentlewoman for attempting to send some direction to FEMA. It is shameful and outrageous what has happened with the poor victims of Hurricane Katrina. From the time they started with the shelters until now, they have not come up with a reasonable program by which to provide housing.

I thank the gentlewoman for everything she has done, and I simply hope we can get support for this amendment so that the $88 billion that we have appropriated to deal with this catastrophe can be used. I know FEMA has used 25 percent of this money on administrative costs. That is outrageous. We want that money to be used to provide shelter to the people who need it.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This issue speaks to who we are as a country. We know there are people living on the streets, and we know there are people who have been really just played around with in terms of you have to evict, you do not. You have 5 more days; you have 10 more days. You have to call this number and get a voucher. Maybe we will extend it another week; maybe it will be 2 weeks. The deadline is tomorrow.

What in the world are these people supposed to do, Mr. Chairman? I think until we fix this where everybody has decent transitional housing, we should just say ''no'' to evictions. That is what this is about. ''No'' to evictions to people who have already been traumatized and hurt.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, it is not true that the time is up. Eligible Hurricane Katrina victims with no other housing means may be eligible for 3 months' worth of housing assistance. And the deadline application for individual assistance has been extended until April 11. So I would urge defeat of this amendment.

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

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

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. LEE:

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

SEC. ——. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Government of the United States to enter into a basing rights agreement between the United States and Iraq.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 15, 2006, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

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

First, I would like to thank the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) for working with me on this amendment and for his leadership and for being here to speak on this today.

This amendment is not about the war, although I offered an alternative to keep us out of Iraq when this war began. This amendment is not about bringing our troops home, although I believe we should do that and do it right away.

This amendment is not about holding the President accountable for misleading us into an unjust and unnecessary war, although he should.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering is very simple. It would provide that no funds would be used under this bill to enter into military base agreements between the United States and Iraq. Stating this will clearly indicate that the United States has no intention of making military bases permanent.

Mr. Chairman, can't we all agree on that right here and now, that we should not be in Iraq permanently? Unfortunately, this administration's position is unclear.

The President shares our views and said as much, I thought. On April 13, 2004, President Bush said, ''As a proud and independent people, Iraqis do not support an indefinite occupation, and neither does America.''

But just yesterday, General Abizaid, the general in charge of U.S. troops in Iraq, told a Defense Appropriations Committee that the U.S. could end up having bases in Iraq. So I think we need to be clear. The aim of my amendment is to simply codify the sentiment that the President and many of our constituents and many of us strongly believe here.

As we stand here today, the United States has renewed a bombing campaign against the insurgents, the largest assault since the invasion; and this is taking us in exactly the wrong direction. Destroying villages in the hopes of routing out insurgents only creates more insurgents.

In adopting this amendment, we can take the target off our troops' backs by sending a strong and immediate signal to the Iraqi people, the insurgents, and the international community that the United States has no designs on Iraq.

This very simple point is supported by a poll conducted by the University of Maryland's Program on International Policy Attitudes earlier this year. They found that 76 percent of Iraqis believe that the United States

will maintain bases in Iraq permanently even if the newly elected government asks the United States to leave Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, we need to be on record that we must not have permanent military bases in Iraq. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

□ 1645

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time and also for her leadership on this issue. She and I both have bills to make U.S. policy that there be no permanent military bases in Iraq; and that is what we are, an amendment to that effect is here today. It reads that none of the funds made available under this act may be used by the government of the United States to enter into a basing rights agreement between the United States and Iraq.

It is true that the administration is unclear on this. Secretary Rumsfeld has said we have no plans or no discussions under way to have permanent bases in that country. But I just got off the phone with a reporter from Maine who said his son served there and those aren't temporary bases that we have there.

General Casey has said that we should gradually reduce the visibility of coalition forces across Iraq because that would take away one of the elements that fuels the insurgency.

What we have learned in a very painful way is that the opinions of other people matter. The opinions of the Iraqis matter. They believe we came there to take their oil, and they believe that we are going to stay there permanently. We have to make an official U.S. policy that we will not stay in Iraq on a permanent basis, that we are going to withdraw our troops, that we will not have military bases there; and that will help diminish somewhat the insurgency that is raging there today.

Just last week General Abizaid testified that the United States may still wish to maintain a long-term presence in the region. It is that kind of confusion, those kinds of mixed signals that we need to clear up with this amendment today.

The Zogby poll recently indicated that 70 percent of American troops believe we should be out of Iraq within the year. Our troops deserve to be told that we are not going to stay. The Iraqis need to be assured that we are not going to say, and this amendment is the path to that result.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to cosponsor the Lee amendment to prohibit any funds from the supplemental from being used to enter into a basing rights agreement between the United States and Iraq. It is clear that the Iraqis, Shiites and Sunnis alike, in overwhelming numbers, do not want us to stay there. And the Secretary of Defense has said that there are no plans or discussions under way to have permanent bases in that country. So this would codify that. This would make sure that that is true.

And yet it has been suggested by top military leaders, including General John Abizaid, as recently as this week, that the United States may want to keep a long-term military presence in Iraq. If true, this is a scheme fraught with danger. As anyone knows that watches television or reads the paper, the presence of U.S. troops in Iraq has been a powerful recruiting tool for the Iraqi insurgency. And General George Casey has agreed with that, saying that by getting our troops out of there that we would take away one of the elements that fuels the insurgency. Please support this amendment. It is good for our troops and good for our country and theirs.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the House, this is a great opportunity in the amendment brought forward by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE). The reason this is a good opportunity, it gets to the heart of what is tearing us apart and preventing us from being as effective as we could in the Middle East. The best way to do that is to clearly express, by statute, the fact that we are not there to build military permanent bases. And the reason is that when we do that we will alleviate a lot of the problem and suspicions that currently exist.

Join us in this bipartisan effort to make sure that American intentions in the Middle East are for the first time explicitly stated by law.

Ms. LEE. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, in December 2004, I requested the Congressional Research Service to compile a report on military construction in both Iraq and Afghanistan. On April 11, 2005, I received the final report. Here is what it said: the Congressional Research Service found projects that suggest a longer term U.S. presence in Iraq. These included $214 million for the Balad Air Base and $49 million for the Taji military complex.

This is the first congressional report that identified specific locations in Iraq where the U.S. is possibly constructing a permanent military presence in Iraq. At the appropriate time, I will enter this in the RECORD.

Now I want to know, did anyone here vote to establish permanent bases in Iraq when they voted to invade that country? Did anyone here vote to send U.S. troops permanently to Iraq? Weren't we going to war on the belief Iraq had weapons of mass destruction? Weren't we going to war on the belief that Iraq was an imminent threat of a mushroom cloud the administration warned about? All that proved to be false. If the President had told you he wanted to spend over $300 billion and 2,300 American lives, plus tens of thousands of maimed servicemembers to build new military bases, permanent deployment of U.S. troops in the Mesopotamian Valley, would anyone here have supported that? I don't think so.

That is why this administration had to fabricate a pretense for the invasion, and that is why you have to support the Lee amendment today. Do not allow this ill-conceived war to lead to a permanent deployment of troops in Iraq. Bring them home. Close down those bases.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN).

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

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, this month marks the third anniversary of the U.S. invasion of Iraq. Our troops, who have performed heroically, want to finish their mission and return home.

Success in Iraq depends on true power-sharing, and that will not happen so long as Iraqis suspect that the United States will maintain permanent military bases. That is why I strongly support the Lee amendment, which will send a clear signal to the Iraqi people that the United States does not seek a permanent presence.

Mr. Chairman, I have spoken to the President, the Vice President, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff about this. Statements by Secretary Rumsfeld alone are not sufficient. Only when the President makes clear that we intend to leave Iraq, not to referee a civil war, will Iraqis realize that power-sharing is their best and last hope.

I thank my good friend, Congresswoman LEE, for introducing this important amendment, and I thank her for her courageous stands all the time in the House.

Ms. LEE. I yield 1 minute 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, this is an important statement that we are making. And again I am sure that we will experience ridicule because I will stand here and say that I believe that the troops have done their job, their patriotic job, the job of defending America. They have won the victory, and it is time for them to come home.

We must redeploy our troops. And for all of those who say that many of us do not have a plan, we do. And that plan incorporates the gentlewoman's amendment, and I thank her for her leadership, and that is that we want to redeploy and we want to vest in Iraq and the Iraqi people and soldiers the defense of their nation. Therefore, we want to insure that there will be no basing rights between the United States and Iraq, no permanency, no establishing of our obligation to defend and defend and defend.

We just had a debate about avoiding the eviction of thousands of Americans from places where they are living because they have no place to live because of the hurricane disaster. It is time now to redeploy. We do have a plan for Iraq to control their government and to be able to defend themselves and to bring our troops home and to disestablish any relationship of a base in Iraq.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Lee amendment prohibiting the use of funds to establish permanent American bases on Iraqi soil. We must make clear to the Iraqi people and to the American people that our operations in Iraq are not open-ended and that we have no designs on Iraqi oil and territory.

Earlier this week, in a hearing of the Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Subcommittee, I asked General John Abizaid, the top American general in the Middle East, if he could make an unequivocal commitment that the U.S. does not intend to establish permanent bases in Iraq. His answer was that he could not.

Two days after our Ambassador to Iraq said that the U.S. has, ''no goal of establishing permanent bases in Iraq,'' General Abizaid said that the policy on long-term presence in Iraq had not been formulated. Three years into this war, if administration officials cannot make up their minds and articulate a coherent policy, it is time that Congress did it for them. Support the Lee amendment.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. President, we need a sign. The American people believed you when you told us that you had to have a preemptive strike because there were weapons of mass destruction. There were no weapons of mass destruction.

You told us we would be welcome, our soldiers would be welcome with open arms. They are not welcome with open arms. The Sunnis, the Shiites and the Kurds all want to end this occupation. They want us out of there.

Mr. President, you told us that the oil that you would pump from the oil wells in Iraq would pay for the rebuilding of Iraq. They are pumping less oil now than they were before the war.

You claimed that you were training soldiers to take over the security of the country. But we are finding bodies every day. In the last 2 days, there were 85 bodies found. In the last couple of weeks, there have been over 2,000 bodies found. The civil war has begun. The IEDs are exploding every day.

And Mr. President, you said that you would redeploy. We need you to give us a sign. All of those people who support him, you need to give us a sign. You can do that with this amendment by simply supporting the Lee amendment that will not allow for permanent bases. You have let us down on everything else. You can do this one. Support the Lee amendment. No permanent bases in Iraq.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Northern California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Every single Member of Congress should be able to support this amendment, unless, of course, the goal is to have permanent presence in Iraq. We can demonstrate to the Iraqi people that we won't occupy their country indefinitely by voting ''yes'' today.

In fact, the Iraqi insurgency is largely incited by the very fact that after 3 full years of war, we show no intention of leaving. Our military presence must end. We must bring our troops home. We must give Iraq back to the Iraqi people. And in so doing, no permanent bases and no control over their oil.

Mr. Chairman, ending the war and helping the Iraqi people get back on their feet is absolutely possible, and it must start now. We can start this process by making a strong statement that the United States of America has no plan to maintain a permanent military presence in Iraq.

I urge all of my colleagues vote for the Lee-Allen amendment.

□ 1700

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the gentlewoman from California for this amendment, which prevents funding for permanent bases in Iraq, and also because it draws our attention to other consequences.

One is the tragic occupation, which has been going on in Iraq now for almost 3 years, and the consequences of that tragic occupation, which has been endorsed and supported by this Congress over and over again. It also draws our attention to the rationale for the invasion of Iraq and the subsequent occupation, a rationale which was presented to this Congress and to the American people in the most fraudulent and deceitful way.

It draws attention to the fact that it is a criminal violation of Federal law to present false and misleading information to the Congress in order to get them to take action. Most importantly, it draws our attention to the fact that the Congress has done nothing about it. We are now facing the third anniversary of the invasion and subsequent occupation of Iraq, and we must face the fact that this Congress has failed in its obligations and responsibilities to oversee the executive branch.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. POE). The gentlewoman from California has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, let me ask the gentlewoman a question on my time.

Do you know how many additional speakers you may have?

Ms. LEE. I believe Mr. HINCHEY needs another minute and Mr. MORAN needs 1½ minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Frankly I will be glad to yield to the two of them some of my time and I presume that you might want to use the last minute to close and we can close this up.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague from the committee.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from the Appropriations Committee and my good friend from California. I want my colleagues to consider some facts.

One is with this amendment that we will have now spent as much as we did in the entire Vietnam War. Does anybody think that that $400 billion was well spent in retrospect? Consider the fact that 82 percent of the Sunnis and 69 percent of the Shi'a want us to withdraw immediately. In fact, the majority say that our presence is hurting rather than helping Iraq's future. Consider what happened when the British concluded their occupation.

The first people the Iraqis went after were those who cooperated with the British, considering them collaborators. Then they went after the foreigners that were trying to exploit the situation. We have a responsibility to get those foreign terrorists, al-Zarqawi and all of the al-Qaeda.

But the Iraqi people were never a threat to the United States. They are not now. Let us work with the Iraqis, get rid of the foreign terrorists, but not establish any permanent bases in Iraq.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I will just close by thanking you, Mr. LEWIS, for giving us time and for allowing for those who have a real perspective, the passion, the understanding to speak on this issue tonight. It is so important that the country understand that whether we agreed or disagreed with the war, that many of us believe there should be no permanent presence in Iraq.

We support our troops. We want them out of harm's way. We know that any notion of a permanent occupation or permanent bases continues to put our young men and women in harm's way. It is about time now that these signals be clear to the rest of the world. As I

said, we get mixed signals from the administration.

I think it is now the time for this House to say that whatever we believed, when this war started, we do not want to be a permanent occupying force, and we do not want permanent military bases in Iraq.

Thank you for being so generous, Mr. LEWIS.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, in the time I have spent in and around Iraq I have seen a fabulous facility at Camp Doha that is meeting most of our challenges in the region. I see it developing significantly in the future. I don't see a need for a permanent facility in Iraq. I doubt there will even be a suggestion of that. On the other hand, I think the discussion was very healthy.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from California.

When the president took our country to war, he promised that victory would be swift and that our troops would not stay in Iraq one day longer than necessary.

Three years and 300 billion dollars later, with over 2,300 American soldiers dead and more than ten thousand wounded, victory is nowhere in sight.

The president and vice president, the secretary of defense and high ranking generals have continued to assure the American people that our presence in Iraq is temporary.

Yet, at the same time, the Department of Defense is paying Halliburton subsidiary Kellog Brown and Root billions of dollars to build 14 ''enduring'' bases in Iraq.

The Iraqis see what is happening on the ground, and they haven't fallen for the Administration's misrepresentation.

According to recent opinion polls, a large majority of Iraqis believe that the U.S. military has no intention to leave Iraq, and that it would stay even is asked by the Iraqi government to leave.

The presence of American troops is fueling the insurgency in Iraq, as acknowledged by General Casey and numerous other experts, and is helping terrorist recruiters build their numbers across the globe.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to continue sending these mixed signals.

If we want to build the Iraqis' confidence about our intentions in their country, if we want to stop adding fuel to the fire of insurgency and terrorism, we must clarify our intent.

Because the Administration is unable to send a clear message about America's intentions in Iraq, Congress must take this responsibility.

We must make our policy of no permanent bases explicit by force of law.

Mr. Chairman, the concern raised in the gentlelady from California's amendment is the same concern that has determined my vote on the underlying bill. The Administration and the majority in this body continue to evade the question of how long we will remain in Iraq, and how much we plan to spend on this war.

It is with deep regret that I vote against passage of this supplemental.

Since Hurricane Katrina wrought havoc on our Gulf coast, I have decried the federal government's stingy approach to aid and reconstruction.

I have joined with my colleagues for years in urging the Administration to provide more funding for veterans' benefits.

I fully support increased LIHEAP funding, as well as aid to Liberia and Sudan.

But, Mr. Chairman, I will not be held hostage by the majority's cynical two-step trick to ensure continued funding for their failed policy in Iraq.

The majority continues to separate Iraq funding from the overall defense budget so that they can hide the true cost of the war and then force the Congress to pass these so-called ''emergency'' supplemental appropriations.

And the majority has bundled this war appropriation with funding for numerous important programs that we all favor, in order to force the legislation through and do an end run around real debate.

I am a Korean War veteran. I support our troops as much as anyone in this body, but I do so by advocating redeployment out of Iraq as soon as it can be safely done. I would vote any time for additional funds to pay for such safe redeployment. For this reason I have signed on to the proposal of my colleague Mr. MCGOVERN, H.R. 4232, the End of the War in Iraq Act.

Mr. Chairman, this vote is not about ''supporting the troops.'' This bill is just one more attempt to tie the Congress' hands by forcing us to give up our only means of control over the war, the power of the purse. I will not be blackmailed into approving funding for an open-ended continuation of our participation in hostilities in Iraq. If the Congress acquiesces on this vote, it is in effect agreeing to fund this disastrous policy for as long as this Administration sees fit. From all indications, no end is in sight.

Mr. Chairman, the price for continuing this war is too high, not only in budgetary terms, but in American lives, Iraqi civilian casualties blamed on America and in the steady increase in the terrorist ranks that this war is provoking around the globe.

The American taxpayers should not have to send one more penny on the Administration's Iraq misadventure. Let's give our troops the supplies they need to get out of Iraq safely. Let's bring our troops home.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Chairman, I seek time to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, the rules prevent us from offering an amendment to the underlying bill to address health problems arising in the aftermath of Katrina. Thus I thank the gentleman for yielding the time to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who has worked very hard on Katrina issues, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) who has likewise been a stalwart supporter of those of us who are working so hard to bring our region back.

Mr. Chairman, rebuilding the Medical Center of Louisiana at New Orleans as a comprehensive public health hospital is a number 1 priority for public health and health care infrastructure of New Orleans since Katrina. Compared to most cities, New Orleans has a large percentage of poor and unhealthy residents.

Mr. Chairman, this perspective is not shared by FEMA. To date, FEMA has authorized $23 million out of $258 million requested. I thank the gentleman very much for permitting me to enter into this colloquy.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would just say I am very happy to work with the gentleman to try to deal with the problem.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, further, I look forward to working with both the gentlemen and am anxious to do everything we can to make this thing work as we deliver aid and support to the people in and around New Orleans.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments?

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of Rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. WAXMAN of California.

The first amendment by Ms. VELÁZQUEZ of New York.

The second amendment by Ms. VELÁZQUEZ of New York.

Amendment by Ms. LEE of California.

Under the previous order of the House of today, the Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 225, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

AYES—193

Abercrombie	Bean	Blumenauer
Ackerman	Becerra	Boswell
Allen	Berkley	Boucher
Andrews	Berman	Boyd
Baca	Berry	Bradley (NH)
Baird	Bishop (GA)	Brady (PA)
Baldwin	Bishop (NY)	Brown (OH)

Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chabot
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dingell
Doggett
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—225

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

NOT VOTING—14

Boren
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Duncan
Evans
Ford
Hastings (FL)
McHenry
McMorris
Radanovich
Ryan (OH)
Shimkus
Sweeney
Weldon (FL)

□ 1732

Messrs. CALVERT, GARRETT of New Jersey, LARSON of Connecticut, GOODE, TOWNS and SAM JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. CAPUANO, MEEK of Florida and GRIJALVA changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 60 on the Waxman amendments to H.R. 4939, I was on a leave of absence due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

Stated against:

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 60 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. POE). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 201, noes 213, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]

AYES—201

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—213

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons

Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—18

Boren
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Duncan
Evans
Hastings (FL)
Hunter
Issa
Kennedy (RI)
Larsen (WA)
Lewis (KY)
McMorris
Radanovich
Ryan (OH)
Shimkus
Sweeney
Waters
Weldon (FL)

□ 1736

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 61, I was in a meeting with the Minister of Northern Ireland and missed the 2 minute vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 61 on the Velázquez amendment to H.R. 4939, to prohibit the use of funds from being made available to enforce deadlines regarding economic injury disaster loan applications and physical loan applications, I was on a leave of absence due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the second amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 200, noes 219, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

AYES—200

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Whitfield
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—219

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

NOT VOTING—13

Boren
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Duncan
Evans
Hastings (FL)
Kirk
McMorris
Radanovich
Shimkus
Sweeney
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)

□ 1740

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 62 on the Velázquez amendment to H.R. 4939, to prohibit the use of funds from being available to make or guarantee a loan under section 7(b) of the Small Business Act other than a loan for which the borrower is charged an interest rate in accordance with section 7(c)(5), I was on a leave of absence due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall Nos. 60, 61, and 62, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 230, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]

AYES—189

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—230

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

NOT VOTING—13

Boren
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Diaz-Balart, M.
Duncan
Evans
Harris
Hastings (FL)
McMorris
Radanovich
Shimkus
Smith (TX)
Sweeney

□ 1745

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 63 on the Lee amendment to H.R. 4939, to prohibit the use of funds from being available to implement, administer, or enforce the termination of the hotel and motel emergency sheltering program established by FEMA for families displaced by Hurricane Katrina and other hurricanes of the 2005 season, I was on a leave of absence due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, Congressman JACK MURTHA from Pennsylvania, a decorated Marine from the Vietnam War and the most respected person in the House of Representatives on military affairs, has the Iraq situation just about right. A free and stable Iraq cannot be achieved militarily. We should not be suffering casualties nearly three years after that fateful day on the carrier off San Diego when President Bush declared "Mission Accomplished," and yet 93 percent of our casualties have occurred since that day.

The Iraqis must make hard political decisions. They must decide if they want a unified country with shared power and responsibility proportionate to population and protected rights for all. As long as we run the military operations and bear the brunt of casualties, the political decisions are avoided. We must make it clear that we will not be caught in their civil war if the Iraqis do not want a unified country enough to avoid a civil war politically.

We must make a concerted effort to persuade the EU, NATO and the rest of our allies to help train Iraqi security forces and establish a judicial system so Iraqis can regain their lives. President Bush's repeated claim that nearly 200,000 Iraqi police and army personnel have been trained to secure Iraq has been disputed for months, even by our own military leaders. However, those Iraqis, whatever their numbers, must stand up for a unified Iraq if that is what they want and believe in. Finally, we need to withdraw from Iraq expeditiously within 2006.

I am voting against this supplemental budget because it simply enables the president to continue his totally flawed and incompetently managed misadventure without forcing the Iraqis to reach political accommodations that can end the insurgency and create a stable, unified country. This war supplemental will be followed by another equally large one as soon as our November elections have passed. You can bet on it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of the supplemental budget despite reservations about parts of this legislation. While I think this bill could be substantially improved, I also believe that, on balance, it does more good than harm. This bill provides funds for a number of important purposes, including the equipment necessary to support and protect our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan; emergency relief for the victims of hurricane Katrina; and funds to support international efforts to stop the mass killings of innocent people in Sudan. I will address each of these in turn.

Let me start with Iraq. While I opposed the President's decision to go to war in Iraq and Afghanistan, I am supporting this bill because I believe we must provide our troops with the necessary equipment while they are there. I also believe, however, that the President has failed to provide the American people with a viable plan for success in Iraq. This bill fails to include benchmarks to hold the Administration accountable. The bill also fails to include adequate safeguards to ensure that the funds are spent responsibly.

Millions of dollars have already been lost or wasted in Iraq due to poor oversight. Every effort must be made to prevent another Halliburton from growing fat at the expense of the American taxpayer. I recently supported an amendment in the Government Reform Committee that would have held the federal government responsible for overspending and

general mismanagement of federal funds. Despite the common sense nature of this amendment, it failed on a party line vote. This Congress has totally failed in its oversight responsibilities with respect to these funds.

Let me now turn to Afghanistan. I supported the decision to take military action against al Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan. I believe we have not yet completed our mission there. Osama bin Laden remains at large, al Qaeda continues to operate and the Taliban have stepped up their attacks. In the face of these realities, the funds provided for U.S. and international efforts in Afghanistan are inadequate.

During a recent hearing before the House Appropriations Committee, Ronald Neumann, our Ambassador in Afghanistan testified that not enough was being been appropriated for our efforts there. I agree. This bill fails to meet the commitments we have made to Afghanistan. It defers the promised cancellation of Afghanistan's $11 million debt owed to the United States; it cuts $16 million from USAID for mission security in Afghanistan and reduces by $2.2 billion Department of Defense funds for Afghan security force training. The bill also cuts funds for counter-narcotics activities in Afghanistan from $193 million to $157 million.

As U.S. commanders prepare to devolve more responsibility for security to other coalition partners and to the Afghans, they must account for the fact that it could take years and billions of dollars to achieve the level of self-sustainability necessary to provide for Afghanistan's infrastructure and national security needs.

A critical test will occur this summer as the U.S. military officially hands over control of the dangerous southern region to NATO forces. Counter-insurgency has never been NATO's job and there are questions about whether it is ready and willing to take on this new role. The volatile southern region has the highest incidents of terrorism, drug trafficking and organized crime in the country. Of the more than 100 American soldiers killed in insurgency attacks in the last year—most of the deaths occurred in the southern region.

We must recognize that it is in our national security interest to work with the Afghan people. We must work to accelerate efforts to build and strengthen national institutions, the economy and Afghan security. By reducing the funding for Afghan operations at this critical time we are sending the wrong message to our troops, to our allies and to the people of Afghanistan.

Next, to help the victims of Hurricane Katrina, the bill contains $19 billion to aid recovery and reconstruction efforts. Most of the funds will go to the Federal Emergency Management Agency but $4 billion will go towards community development and for loans to homeowners, renters and businesses. Months after the hurricane, thousands of people are still looking for permanent homes. This funding will help citizens displaced by Hurricane Katrina rebuild their lives.

This bill also contains emergency funding to help those suffering in Sudan. The United States and the international community have failed to take adequate steps to stop the genocide. This bill at least attempts to alleviate the suffering. It includes $66 million for humanitarian support, $11 million to assist refugees in Darfur and Chad to return to their homes, $150 million for food, $123 million to support African Union troops and, with the adoption of the Capuano amendment, $88 million to prepare for the transition to UN peacekeepers.

Mr. Chairman, despite the reservations I have raised, I believe the bill deserves our support.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, H.R. 4939. This supplemental bill, totaling $91.8 billion, is the largest that the House of Representatives has ever considered.

As I have said repeatedly on the House floor, I strongly oppose using so-called ''emergency supplementals'' to fund non-emergency, clearly foreseeable expenditures. This bill provides $72 billion for continued military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The fact that our troops are on the ground in these dangerous places is not a surprise. They have been in Iraq for almost three years. Their needs are well known to everyone, except, it seems, the President and his budget staff. Every year, the President fails to budget for the cost of military operations, and every year he pretends that the war is an unforeseen ''emergency''.

Funding our soldiers this way is dangerous because it leaves them ill-equipped and subject to last minute actions like this by Congress. If, by contrast, we funded military operations through the normal budget process, funding decisions would be made in the open and with the appropriate scrutiny they deserve. It would also allow for long term planning and more thoughtful budgeting. We have all read about the contracting waste and fraud that has occurred in Iraq. A number of no-bid and open ended contracts have wasted millions of taxpayer's dollars. This waste has made a few crooked businessmen wealthy and done nothing to protect our troops or help build a more stable democracy in Iraq.

Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, I refuse to continue to fund a failed policy. I opposed this war because I did not think the President had made a convincing case for the existence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq and I opposed his illegal doctrine of preemption. Since then I have only been heartbroken by the utter incompetence of which it has been planned. Our soldiers are doing outstanding work, and I salute their sacrifice. But the policy-makers in Washington have let them down and put them in an impossible situation. As I said in a letter to Secretary Rice last September, it is time to begin bringing our soldiers home. Spending good money after bad on a failed policy puts our soldiers, and our national security in even greater risk.

There are portions of this bill that should have been in the President's budget last year. For example, I fully support up-armoring HUMVEE's and tanks in Iraq. I also support investing $59 million to fund foreign language proficiency pay. I also support the $1.4 billion in the bill to fund family separation allowances, hardship duty, and combat pay.

Yet, all of these funds could have, and should have, been included in the regular budget process. But they were not.

Let me talk for a moment about the other good portions of this bill which were attached by the Majority in a cynical attempt to buy votes for the overall bill.

There is true emergency funding in this bill. But it is money for Sudan and the Gulf Coast, not Iraq.

This bill also contains money to help in the recovery of another emergency, one that struck our own shore. Just over six months ago, the Gulf Coast was struck by Hurricane Katrina. I have visited the Gulf Coast and found that the destruction was terrible, with hundreds of thousands uprooted only to return and discover their homes were obliterated. The debris is still being cleaned. The people of the Gulf Coast region are looking to rebuild and continue their lives, and this bill provides $19 billion in needed funds to assist in financing the rebuilding effort. This money helps us to keep faith with those who were failed by their government in the days and weeks following Hurricane Katrina. I am voting for an amendment that would increase by $2 billion community development funds available to assist local communities rebuild.

The genocide that continues to this day in Darfur, in the Sudan, is unconscionable. The President has said this, the Secretary of State has said this. Further, I have said a number of times that America needs to do everything it can to end the Darfur genocide. This bill contains $514 million for Sudan, with a large portion going to the Darfur region to fund the African Union peace keeping mission. I strongly support this funding. There is a true emergency in Sudan and I am glad that this money will be provided to end the genocide and provide humanitarian assistance to devastated people in the region. I am voting for the Capuano Amendment to add an additional $50 million to help fund extra peacekeepers in Darfur.

I am sorry that these true emergency funds were attached to the foreseeable spending for the ongoing operations in Iraq. I have voted for rebuilding the Gulf Coast and ending the genocide in Darfur in the past, and I will continue to do so. But I will not fund a failed policy in Iraq that is jeopardizing our soldiers needlessly, stoking the insurgency, draining our national resources, and doing nothing to protect Americans from terrorism at home.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my strong objection to the House Republican Leadership combining two separate emergency supplementals into a single bill. The response to Hurricane Katrina and the Iraqi war deserve separate debates and significant oversight and deliberation.

The human suffering that our neighbors along the Gulf Coast experienced and continue to experience seven months later cannot be underestimated. It will take a sustained federal and state, public and private commitment to help those affected get back on their feet. While I support a long-term reconstruction of the Gulf region, I cannot in good conscience vote for this bill.

I strongly believe we need better oversight of supplemental funding bills, particularly those that fund ''the long war.'' There were excellent amendments offered on the floor today that I supported that should have passed if Congress had been exercising its Constitutional oversight role. For instance, I supported an Iraqi contracting amendment and one to prevent permanent bases in Iraq. We cannot become occupiers.

On this third anniversary of the war, our soldiers, our national guard, their families and all Americans deserve better than platitudes from

the Administration. I have repeatedly called for greater Congressional oversight and an exit strategy, while recognizing that our troops have done an excellent job, despite often lacking sufficient body armor or equipment. I welcome the President's statements that troops will be drawn down by the end of the year, but I believe that our soldiers are being placed in an untenable situation, and need to be brought home as soon as possible.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 4939. I would like to thank the Appropriations Committee leadership for their efforts to provide our men and women in uniform with the equipment that they need as they continue their efforts in Iraq, Afghanistan and throughout the world. My colleagues on the House Armed Services Committee and I have fought for enhanced force protection equipment, much of which is included in this bill. H.R. 4939 includes $410 million for up-armored Humvees and $2 billion to develop and procure jammers for improvised explosive devices. Given the number of U.S. casualties resulting from IEDs, jammer technology is one of the most important investments this Congress can make to protect our troops.

I am also pleased that this legislation provides more than $19 billion in much-needed assistance to the victims of Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Wilma. Months after those storms battered our Gulf Coast, many Americans are still displaced, and basic services are not available in places like New Orleans. Given the federal government's insufficient efforts in the wake of Hurricane Katrina, it is our responsibility to provide the affected residents and businesses with the resources and assistance they need to rebuild.

This measure will also greatly assist those facing exorbitant heating bills this winter. After Hurricanes Katrina and Rita damaged domestic energy sources, all Americans experienced higher energy costs, but the burden was particularly heavy for low-income residents in cold climates. H.R. 4939 will allow states to access $1 billion in Low Income Home Energy Assistance (LIHEAP) funding more quickly, which will be welcome news to states such as Rhode Island that are struggling to help families in need.

I greatly appreciate the Committee's inclusion of assistance to the victims of genocidal violence in Darfur and to train and equip the African Union peacekeeping troops. To date, at least one hundred thousand people have been killed, with millions more displaced. It is impossible to view the images from Sudan without being outraged at the cruelty and injustice of the situation. Our nation must do more to prevent further violence. Last year, I advocated for funding for African Union peacekeepers in the Defense Appropriations bill, and though that was not successful, H.R. 4939 funds peacekeeping missions in Sudan and encourages greater involvement by the United Nations.

Finally, in welcome news to the American people, the legislation blocks Dubai Ports World from assuming control over six U.S. ports as part of their acquisition of P&O Steam Navigation Company. As a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I strongly opposed the sale because of the lack of a comprehensive investigation into the national security implications. We need to ensure that foreign investment decisions are based on real national security considerations and not just financial gain. I have been working to enhance port security in our nation, and the Dubai ports deal reminds Americans that until appropriate measures are taken, our ports will continue to be vulnerable. I am pleased that H.R. 4939 contains this commonsense provision, but we must do more to secure our infrastructure and improve Congressional oversight of foreign investment decisions.

Again, I thank my colleagues for their efforts on this important bill, and I urge all Members to support its passage.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to tell a tale of two Republican disasters, the Iraq War and Hurricane Katrina. It is a story with no best of times, only the worst of times. This tale is why I oppose the Supplemental Appropriations Act (H.R. 4939).

The main characters in my story are an incompetent President and a corrupt Congress. The setting is an America desperate for honest leadership. But the plot involves lies and cover-ups. The problem is misplaced priorities. But the solution is not this supplemental, which provides another $67.6 billion for a failed war but only $19 billion to help the victims of Katrina.

The first disaster, the Iraq War, was predicated on lies. Iraq had no weapons of mass destruction, had never attempted to buy uranium from Niger, and was not about to welcome American soldiers with open arms.

An incompetent President failed to prepare America for the postwar period. As a result, looting of stores and museums began shortly after the United States military gained control of Baghdad. Months later, sectarian violence has pushed Iraq to civil war, with Shiite militia and security forces clashing with Sunni citizens and insurgents.

Yet our troops remain in Iraq and in harms way. Two American soldiers and 40 Iraqi soldiers and civilians are killed every day. As long as we stay in Iraq, the insurgency will continue, even as the so-called Iraqi democracy experiment goes nowhere. Three months after parliamentary elections, the Iraqi parliament has yet to form a government.

Finally, large Republican donors including Halliburton have looted the American treasury. Using their connections to secure no-bid contracts for services in Iraq, these firms overcharge American taxpayers and underserve our troops. All the while, Republicans' blind allegiance to the President causes them to write blank checks, throwing good money after bad at a war that is making America less secure.

The second disaster was the Republican response to Hurricane Katrina. Several days before Katrina ravaged the Gulf Coast, the President was briefed on the severity of the storm and the likelihood levees would be breached. But after failing to cut short his extended vacation to help with the response, the President told ABC News and the American public he was not advised the levees were likely to collapse.

After years of underfunding levee construction and maintenance, Republicans attempted to shift the blame for the disaster and the inadequate response onto state and local officials. But it was President Bush who nominated unqualified campaign hacks to head FEMA and congressional Republicans who rubber-stamped the appointment of Michael Brown.

As a result of insufficient preparation and incompetent administration, tens of thousands of hurricane victims went without adequate food, water, and shelter in the storm's aftermath. Six months after Katrina, relief workers are still finding bodies of victims.

In an attempt to atone for their sins, the Republicans have finally brought forth additional legislation to help Katrina victims. But in a pathetic and transparent attempt to prevent full debate on the disastrous Iraq War, President Bush's Republican cronies in Congress combined two supplementals into one.

Although I support additional funding for hurricane victims, I cannot vote for a supplemental that appropriates 74 percent of its funds, or $67.6 billion, to a misguided Iraq war on which we have already wasted $350 billion—and the lives of 2,310 American soldiers and at least 37,000 Iraqi citizens.

It is time to tell a new tale, about bringing home our troops and rebuilding homes for Katrina victims. Let's get this Iraq monkey off our back and supplement housing rather than Halliburton.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill, and help me to tell a new tale about American successes rather than Republicans disasters.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in protest at this Administration's egregious treatment of tens of thousands of families of survivors who were displaced by and continue to suffer in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. Today, on the Ides of March, some ten thousand families are being evicted from temporary housing in hotels by FEMA.

This would have happened months ago but for cries of protest and legal injunctions that forced FEMA to keep rolling back the eviction deadline: December 15th, January 7th, January 31st, February 15th, February 28th, and now March 15th—on each of these dates, families were evicted.

So to the 10,000 families being evicted today, we must add some 30,000 families already evicted, giving us a figure of some 40,000 families who will have been evacuated from temporary housing in hotels.

FEMA and DHS have not provided any comprehensive plan to transition these survivors out of temporary and into permanent shelters, and while tens of thousands are already living in tents and cars, thousands more are being thrown out to sleep on the streets, because the shelters are already full.

Last week, during one of his rare visits to the Gulf Coast, the President bluntly accused Congress of moving too slow in providing funds for housing and reconstruction.

Let me read to the House a passage from the Stafford Act. This is from Section 407:

The President is authorized to provide assistance on a temporary basis in the form of mortgage or rental payments to or on behalf of individuals and families who, as a result of financial hardship caused by a major disaster, have received written notice of dispossession or eviction from a residence by reason of a foreclosure of any mortgage or lien, cancellation of any contract of sale, or termination of any lease entered into prior to such disaster. Such assistance shall be provided for the duration of the period or financial hardship but not to exceed 18 months.

So under the Stafford Act, survivors being evicted from temporary housing are entitled to 18 months of housing assistance, that means another full year, of rental assistance, but only if the President authorizes the necessary sums.

Rather than stepping in and taking charge, the President is passing the blame back to the Congress for a ''Failure of Initiative,'' the title of a report coming from his own party, which delivered stinging criticism of the Administration's handling of the aftermath of Katrina.

Mr. Chairman, the failure to take initiative did not arise from this side of the aisle. We now have 77 signatures on H.R. 4197, the Hurricane Katrina Recovery, Reclamation, Restoration, Reconstruction and Reunion Act, which sets out a comprehensive plan to provide housing, health care, education, environmental clean-up, and to meet nearly all of the still urgent needs of the Gulf Coast survivors. And we are calling out to our colleagues across the aisle to join our initiative and do what is just and right for our fellow Americans caught up in the largest population displacement our Nation has seen since the Great Depression and slavery.

As we consider yet another supplemental request for tens of billions for a military occupation of Iraq, where violence is spinning out of control and toward all-out civil war under our watch, let us ask ourselves the hard questions:

How can we deny housing, education and health care to American citizens displaced by Katrina and yet continue to build homes, schools and hospitals in Iraq?

How can we refuse to provide satellite voting for hundreds of thousands of displaced New Orleaneans and yet spend hundreds of millions on satellite voting stations for Iraqis in America?

Why are survivors in Mississippi and Texas entitled to trailers whilst those in Louisiana are not?

Why are hurricane survivors in Florida and Texas entitled to maximum benefits under the Stafford Act whilst Katrina survivors from Mississippi and Louisiana are told they must fend for themselves?

And finally, Mr. Chairman, was the decision to send the poorest and most traumatized survivors of the flooding of New Orleans into diaspora simply an ad hoc decision, or part of an overall strategic plan to keep as many poor and minority residents as possible from returning to New Orleans, in order to lay the groundwork for an urban real estate bonanza? Is this the reason our government is so intent upon refusing New Orleans survivors their basic rights under law?

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, from the beginning, the Bush Administration's policy on Iraq has been based on distortions and misjudgments. Prior to the invasion, I fought to prevent this war. I parted with most members of Congress and cast a vote against the resolution authorizing the use of military force in Iraq. The President misled the American people into believing there was a link between Iraq and the terrorist attacks of September 11, and he distorted and misrepresented intelligence data about weapons of mass destruction.

I understand the frustration and heartbreak that have led many Americans to conclude that it is now time for us to remove ourselves from this misguided quagmire and bring our troops home. That is why I have called on the President to change course. America simply cannot continue indefinitely to pay the high costs in both lives and dollars to stay on the same failed course in Iraq.

In December 2005, I voted for H.R. 1815, the FY 2006 Defense Authorization bill, which the President signed into law in January 2006. Section 1227 of that bill, United States Policy on Iraq, states that it is the sense of Congress that ''calendar year 2006 should be a period of significant transition to full Iraq sovereignty, with Iraqi security forces taking the lead for the security of a free and sovereign Iraq, thereby creating the conditions for the phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq.''

It is time for the President to implement this policy. We have no choice but to approve this spending bill. We cannot put our troops at greater risk. If the President does not heed the intent of Congress and the American people, Congress should take more direct action to bring our troops home promptly and safely. We should not have American troops in the middle of a civil war.

I have repeatedly called for a change in America's policies so that we can bring our troops home as soon as possible. In December 2004, I visited our troops in Iraq. I thanked them for their service and listened to their stories. It was a moving experience for me. I honor the sacrifices they and their families are making each day.

The men and women of our armed forces are demonstrating tremendous dedication to our Nation through their performance in Iraq. These brave soldiers have put their lives in harm's way for our country, and we are forever grateful for their service.

This bill also contains crucial provisions, which I support, that would provide nearly $20 billion for Hurricane Katrina relief, including funds for housing, community planning and development, flood control, and small business loans. In addition, the House should take up H.R. 4197, a comprehensive Hurricane Katrina recovery bill introduced by the Congressional Black Caucus.

I am encouraged that the bill provides more than $500 million to address the ongoing genocide in southern Sudan and Darfur. These funds are critical to meeting the immediate needs of victims of the Darfur crisis, such as shelter, health care, and access to water and sanitation. Sudanese government-backed Arab militias have slaughtered hundreds of thousands of villagers, and they have burned entire villages. Up to two million refugees have fled this genocide to neighboring countries, but the small, poorly-equipped, and underfunded African Union (AU) force cannot offer them adequate protection. This bill provides needed funding to help transition the AU peacekeeping operation to a United Nations mission. It is also encouraging that last week the House International Relations Committee reported out H.R. 3127, the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act, which I urge the House to take up without delay.

Lastly, I strongly support the inclusion of an amendment adopted by the Appropriations Committee to cancel the planned transfer of U.S. ports to Dubai Ports World, which is owned by the United Arab Emirates. Although the UAE recently agreed to abandon its efforts to take over American ports, this Congress still needs to enact bipartisan legislation that I introduced with Ways and Means Trade Subcommittee Chairman CLAY SHAW, H.R. 4839, the Secure America's Port Operations Act, which would prohibit any foreign-government owned operations at U.S. seaports in the future.

Mr. Chairman, this emergency supplemental is a necessary measure that will provide essential support for our troops in their arduous mission in Iraq, vital funding for the global war on terror, and desperately needed assistance for our own Gulf region and the many Americans who have been uprooted by Hurricane Katrina.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. POE). The Clerk will read the final lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006''.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE) having assumed the chair, Mr. POE, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4939) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 725, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. HINCHEY

Mr. HINCHEY. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HINCHEY. Yes, Madam Speaker, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Hinchey of New York moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 4939, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same forthwith to the House with the following amendment:

''On page 82, line 4, strike ''2007'' and insert ''2006''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HINCHEY. Madam Speaker, the motion to recommit is very simple and direct. It says that the appropriations that were directed toward the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for the year 2006 must be spent in

that year, not moved over to the year 2007.

We are doing this for obvious reasons. The high cost of energy is making it extremely difficult for low-income people, particularly elderly, low-income people, to meet their home energy assistance payments, and also to meet their other needs.

It is also affecting large numbers of other people in our communities across the Northeast, the upper Midwest, and elsewhere across the country.

That, and the drop in temperatures recently, is causing some serious problems for many people. We want to make sure that the money that was appropriated for the LIHEAP program is used this year, appropriately so that people do not suffer as a result of its not being used.

I think the case has been made.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I will take 30 seconds.

The House has expressed its will in many ways regarding LIHEAP. We are going to do what is right regarding that funding for 2006 and 2007. To send it back to committee would kill this bill.

The Members have done a fabulous job in a very bipartisan way producing a fine product. I ask for an ''aye'' vote on final passage and against the gentleman's motion.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HINCHEY. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 233, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 64]

AYES—188

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—233

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

NOT VOTING—11

Boren
Cramer
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Duncan
Evans
Hastings (FL)
McMorris
Radanovich
Shimkus
Sweeney

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1809

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This 5-minute vote on passage will be followed by two more 5-minute votes on two postponed questions that were debated yesterday.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 348, nays 71, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

YEAS—348

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Costa
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards

Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Etheridge
Everett
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—71

Abercrombie
Baldwin
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Capps
Clay
Coble
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cubin
Deal (GA)
Eshoo
Farr
Flake
Frank (MA)
Gohmert
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hensarling
Hinchey
Holt
Inslee
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, Sam
King (IA)
Kucinich
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Maloney
Markey
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore (WI)
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Paul
Payne
Pence
Petri
Rangel
Rothman
Schakowsky
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Solis
Stark
Tancredo
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Velázquez
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Westmoreland
Woolsey
Wu

NOT VOTING—13

Boren
Cramer
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Duncan
Emerson
Evans
Hastings (FL)
McMorris
Pickering
Radanovich
Shimkus
Sweeney

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1816

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 for:

Mr. PICKERING. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 65, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 65 on final passage of H.R. 4939, I was on a leave of absence due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

MAKING AVAILABLE FUNDS FOR THE LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 2320.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2320, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 287, nays 128, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 66]

YEAS—287

Abercrombie
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Butterfield
Camp (MI)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Castle
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Gordon
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hart
Hayes
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Sherman
Shuster
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NAYS—128

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Biggert
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boustany
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Chocola
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Emerson
Everett
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Hyde
Issa
Johnson, Sam
King (IA)

Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
McCrery
McHenry
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Pitts
Price (GA)
Putnam
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Sherwood
Simpson
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Ackerman
Boren
Coble
Cramer
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Duncan
Evans
Hastings (FL)
Istook
Lofgren, Zoe
McMorris
Radanovich
Shimkus
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1825

Mr. TERRY, Ms. HARRIS and Mr. ADERHOLT changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

So (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 66 on the motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 2320, I was on a leave of absence due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Mr. TANCREDO. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 66 I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4297, TAX RELIEF EXTENSION RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on H.R. 4297 offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 187, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

YEAS—222

Abercrombie
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Harman
Hefley
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NAYS—187

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
English (PA)
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Green (WI)
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—24

Ackerman
Boren
Brady (TX)
Coble
Cramer
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Duncan
Evans
Everett
Granger
Hastings (FL)
Istook
Jefferson
Kilpatrick (MI)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
McKeon
McMorris
Pombo
Radanovich
Shimkus
Sullivan
Sweeney

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1833

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HUNTER, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted an adverse privileged report (Rept. No. 109–397) on the resolution (H. Res. 685) requesting the President and directing the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in their possession relating to any entity with which the United States has contracted for public relations purposes concerning Iraq, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 361) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 361

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, March 16, 2006, 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, March 28, 2006, 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, March 16, 2006, Friday, March 17, 2006, or Saturday, March 18, 2006, 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, March 27, 2006, or such other time on that day 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 if, 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, MARCH 20, 2006

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today pursuant to this order, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday, March 20, 2006, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in House Concurrent Resolution 361, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 29, 2006

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, March 29, 2006.

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

There was no objection.

HONORING ELEANOR SLATER

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay my respects to Eleanor Slater, a great friend who passed away this week. Known as the grande dame of Rhode Island Democratic politics, Eleanor blazed trails for many people in our state, but especially for women. She began her distinguished political career in 1958 as a Representative in the Rhode Island General Assembly, and championed issues such as mental health, fair housing and especially issues affecting senior citizens.

Always thinking of the next generation, she was a great advisor to many former and current politicians, including myself, Congressman PATRICK KENNEDY, and Senator JACK REED. She had the foresight and belief that I could run for Secretary of State and win that race, which I did. She served as an honorary chair on many of my campaigns and taught me valuable lessons that I still carry with me today.

While I am sad to say goodbye to such a wonderful woman, at 97 years old, we should celebrate Eleanor's long distinguished life. Eleanor, you made a difference. May God bless you and keep you safe in His care.

HONORING MR. LEROY ROBBINS

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, I want to take a moment to honor the life of a very generous man whose service to his family and community made him extraordinary to those of us privileged to know him.

Mr. Leroy Robbins passed away on Sunday, March 5, 2006 in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Mr. Robbins leaves behind his wife, Bernice, nine children, 28 grandchildren and 52 great grandchildren. Yet his legacy extend far beyond his own family.

Mr. Robbins was extraordinary because of his faithfulness in the simple and precious things in life. For more than 50 years, he served as a 4–H Livestock Club Leader.

As a child, I lost my own father and Mr. Robbins' mentorship helped to fill the profound loss created by that particular event. His kindness shined through as he opened his home, lovingly called ''Robbins Roost'' to 30 4–H club Members. He and Mrs. Robbins patiently taught us how to make things, how to improve ourselves and how to be leaders. He just helped us participate in the joy of discovery through the wonderful array of 4–H club opportunities.

Mr. Robbins was a man of generosity, compassion and integrity. In life he demonstrated what it meant to be extraordinary and undoubtedly, his legacy will live on in the lives of those he touched, particularly mine.

HONORING AMEDEE ''DICK'' RICHARDS, JR.

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Amedee Richards, Jr., a treasured member of the South Pasadena community who died Thursday at the age of 84. He was a great man who served for many years as mayor, councilman, and as a small business owner, and he will long be remembered for his influential leadership and the preservation of South Pasadena.

Dick Richards was one of the first people I sought out years ago to get his advice on issues important to the city. He and I shared a background in law enforcement. He was an FBI agent, and I was a Federal prosecutor and we instantly hit it off. Over the years, I continued to turn to him and always valued his thoughtful counsel.

He led many communities endeavors, founding the South Pasadena Relay For Life, serving as President of the Mission West Association, and later, as a founding member of the New South Pasadena Chamber of Commerce. With his wife, Clara, he also opened Family Fair, a gift and candy store, as well as Buster's Ice Cream and Coffee Shop, which both immediately became South Pasadena landmarks. He also helped to start the weekly Farmers' Market in the Mission West District.

I want to express my sincere condolences to the entire family. Sadly, that tremendous family lost another member in the last few days. Dick's eldest son, Amedee III, passed away on Monday morning. My heart goes out to the entire Richards family, Dick's wife, Clara, two sons, six daughters and 15 grandchildren.

Dick called South Pasadena a kind of oasis. In this time of immense grief, I hope our community is comforted in knowing that Dick's legacy as a devoted public servant will live on in the vibrant oasis that he helped to create in South Pasadena.

I rise today to honor Amedee "Dick" Richards Jr., a treasured member of the South Pasadena community, who died Thursday at the age of 84. He was a great man who served for many years—as mayor, councilman, and as a small business owner—and will long be remembered for his influential leadership in the preservation of South Pasadena.

Dick Richards was one of the first people I sought out years ago for advice on issues important to the city. He and I shared a background in law enforcement (he was an FBI agent, and I was a federal prosecutor) and we instantly hit it off. Over the years, I continued to turn to him and always valued his thoughtful counsel. His work, his family, and indeed his life are tremendous examples of what makes South Pasadena such a strong community.

He led many community endeavors, founding the South Pasadena Relay for Life (an annual fundraiser for the American Cancer Society), serving as President of the Mission West Association, and later as a founding member of the New South Pasadena Chamber of

Commerce. With his wife Clara, he also opened Family Fair, a gift and candy store, as well as Buster's Ice Cream and Coffee Shop, which both immediately became instant South Pasadena landmarks. He also helped to start the weekly Farmers' Market in the Mission West District in 1999.

Dick was a man respected and admired by his colleagues and peers. Serving on the South Pasadena City Council from 1989 to 1997, he was admired for both his integrity and courage, always voting his conscience. Dick called South Pasadena a "kind of an oasis" and sought to preserve the small town characteristics that made it unique. Those who worked with him considered themselves fortunate, and as current Mayor Odom Stamps has acknowledged, Dick has "huge shoes that no one person will even remotely fill."

He was born in Worcester, Massachusetts in 1922 and graduated from Boston University in 1943. He then entered the Naval Reserve, serving during World War II in the Pacific theater as an ensign on a mine-sweeper. After WWII, he joined the FBI working specifically on Mafia cases and investigating the assassination of Robert F. Kennedy. He retired from the FBI in 1977, founding Family Fair that same year.

I want to express my sincere condolences to his entire family. And sadly, this tremendous family lost another member in the last few days. Dick's eldest son, Amedee III, passed away on Monday morning. My heart goes out to the entire Richards family, Dick's wife Clara, 2 sons, 6 daughters, and 15 grandchildren.

In this time of immense grief, I hope that our community is comforted in knowing that Dick's legacy as a devoted public servant will live on in the vibrant "oasis" that he created in South Pasadena.

APPOINTMENT OF HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT, HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON, AND HON. WAYNE T. GILCHREST TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH MARCH 28, 2006

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 16, 2006.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROBERT B. ADERHOLT, the Honorable MICHAEL K. SIMPSON, and the Honorable WAYNE T. GILCHREST to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through March 28, 2006.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointment is approved.

There was no objection.

REPORT ON THE NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY OF THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

Consistent with section 108 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended (50 U.S.C. 404a), I am transmitting a report prepared by my Administration on the National Security Strategy of the United States.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 16, 2006.*

AMERICA CAN DO BETTER

(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. Madam Speaker, today and yesterday, we spent time on the floor of the House trying to construct a legislative initiative in the emergency supplemental to rebuild lives of Americans. We also attempted to respond to the rising crisis in Iraq. And I rise today to simply say that I know that America can do better.

In the course of that debate, I heard a story of a woman whose husband is in Iraq, and she is looking to try to understand where the funding is going, or where are the monies that have been appropriated going, because her husband is writing back and telling her about contaminated water and lack of equipment.

And then of course, I met a mother in my district who wondered why her son had to be redeployed for the third time to Iraq. I know America can do better. I am hoping as this emergency supplemental makes its way to the United States Senate that our colleagues, working with the administration, will understand that it is time now to redeploy our troops to bring them home in the honor and victory that they deserve, and then, of course, invest in the rebuilding of the Gulf Coast and not causing the stigmatizing of any of those who have suffered the devastation of Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Wilma, and certainly provide the funding that the State of Texas needs once and for all, a State that has been impacted in a devastating way as we host those who are in need. It is time to do better for Americans.

□ 1845

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). 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.

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.)

NEW YORK TROOPER ANDREW SPERR

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, I request permission to take Mr. JONES' time.

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

There was no objection.

The Speaker pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor New York State Trooper Andrew Sperr. Each person who wears a badge walks a thin blue line between life and death. Their families wonder when their police officer reports for duty, if that person will return home.

On March 1, 2006, Trooper Sperr did not return. He was shot and killed in the line of duty during a blazing gun fight with bank robbers in Big Flats, New York. Just after noon, Andrew Sperr stopped to investigate a suspicious pickup truck on the side of the road. As he approached the vehicle, the robbery suspects opened the door and opened fire on him, striking him multiple times. At least one round struck him in the right side above his body armor.

He was a dedicated lawman, so Trooper Sperr was able to return fire, and he wounded both of the suspects, which eventually led to their arrest, even though he was mortally wounded himself. Andrew Sperr was 33 years of age. He was from Greece, New York, and he had been a member of the New York State police force for 10 years.

Though he had no kids of his own, he was greatly involved in lives of his 10 siblings and their kids, and was godfather to several of his nieces and nephews. He was known as AJ to close family and friends, and he was remembered as always being the center of all activity.

He spent his free time on his 80-acre farm in Steuben County, New York. He loved the outdoors and in his other free time he was a hunter and a wildlife photographer. As a young kid, Andrew Sperr had wanted to serve his community by becoming a peace officer.

In his life and his death, service was his mission. Friends family and coworkers remember him as a compassionate public servant who generally cared about the people he came in contact with on a daily basis, no matter who they were. He had recently won the outstanding trooper award for the second year in a row.

When terrorists struck the World Trade Center in New York City on September 11, 2001, Andrew Sperr was there. He volunteered to go and help the people of New York, as well as the citizens of the United States, by providing law enforcement in the aftermath of that attack on America.

Trooper Sperr also traveled to Louisiana this past fall in Hurricane Katrina and helped those folks in that area, neighbors.

Madam Speaker, as a former judge in Texas, I have had the opportunity to speak several times in New York and to the troopers at the New York State Police Academy in Albany, New York. After we got through the language barrier, I found these right-thinking Americans to be passionate about protecting the citizens of New York State and bringing outlaws to justice.

Trooper Andrew Sperr was proud to be a member of this group of law officers. Trooper Andrew Sperr died doing what he wanted to do, protecting, serving and defending the people. As thousands of his fellow State troopers, law enforcement personnel, friends and family, mourn his loss, our prayers go out to his family for allowing his life to be sacrificed for the rest of us.

Andrew J. Sperr was a dedicated officer and a compassionate friend to all. He served with distinction and honor, and he will be missed. America and Americans were better because of the life of Andrew Sperr. He wore the badge and proudly took the oath to protect and serve.

Madam Speaker, peace officers are the last strand of wire in the fence between safety and anarchy. They are all that stands between the people and the barbarians. Trooper Andrew Sperr died protecting the rest of us from those outlaws.

So God bless those that wear the badge of the American peace officer. That's just the way it is.

PORT SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, many Americans are breathing a sigh of relief. They believe we have resolved the issue of port security, but that is far from the truth. True, for now, the idea of United Arab Emirates operating some of our port terminals has abated. But this is very much just a very small issue regarding port security.

The fact is, our ports are probably today very little less secure than pre-9/11. The grades that the 9/11 Commission give to this administration's efforts on port security were generally failing.

The United States has bound itself to an international agreement through the International Maritime Organization that allowed secret ownership of ships. Osama bin Laden could have a fleet of his own. We are not allowed to know. They fly under flags that countries that provide no supervision, in fact, in the case of Liberia, until recently, didn't even have a government, and barely exist.

They have crews of unknown identity. Yes, they send us a name about the ship lands, but is that really the person. Is that really the background. Do we have fingerprints? No. We don't know who the people are on those ships. The cargo on those ships is not secure. The containers are not secure. It would cost a few dollars to secure a container from loading to unloading in the United States of America and scan it. The Bush administration thinks that is a cost that we cannot afford or would unnecessarily impinge upon free commerce.

Then, of course, the technology, the technology that we don't have at the ports, to adequately scan these containers. Now, we cannot breathe a sigh of relief. Our ports are not yet secure. We depend upon a transmitted manifest. Now, I can just see that the Osama bin Laden line with the terrorist crew is going to send a manifest that says this container has 199 concrete bird baths and one small tactical nuclear weapon, and our intelligence people might even ask to open that container. Who knows, they might not. So we need to do a tremendous amount more.

Then there is another issue. The Bush administration, while Congress is away next week, is intending to put forward a rule that would allow foreign interests to control United States airlines in contravention of a very explicit law which prohibits control by foreign interests. The Bush Administration, using their inherent powers, has decided to reinterpret the meaning of the word control and say Congress just meant they can't control safety and security. We will wall that off.

How are you going to wall it off when you have foreign ownership of a U.S. airline, foreign management and a U.S. airline, foreign board of directors of a formerly U.S. airline, and you are going to wall off safety and security? Oh, come on, give me a break. As the chief operating officer of Continental said, hey, they are against this. They said, hey, I am head of safety, I am the COO, safety and security report to me. I can get someone to do whatever I want in that job, or I will fire them.

That is an extraordinary risk. It risks our civilian reserve air fleet, where we move our troops overseas. Just imagine a future deployment, say to maybe the Taiwan area with a problem with China, and the U.S. troops could be flying on an airline that was owned and controlled by Chinese communist government interests under this rule, which the Bush Administration wants to push through. Or it could be a UAE crew from Dubai, because they are the fastest expanding long-haul airline in the world, with all of their billions of surplus dollars.

We cannot rest easy, because the Bush Administration is continuing to dismantle critical infrastructure. We need a general review of critical infrastructure in this country, and we need to safeguard it. They are saying, no, we shouldn't do that. They are hoping to put the Dubai deal off, you know, and that we will not pay any attention to the threats at our ports or the threats to our airlines and aviation industry, or maybe even under the Bush administration, we will sell our nuclear plants to foreign interests.

Wouldn't that be spiffy if we allowed foreign interests to own our nuclear plants? That would be really, really great for security here in the United States of America. America should not be for sale. It is a symptom of a failed trade policy, and this Bush administration just wants to do more of the same. It is time for change. It is time for new trade policy. It is time to keep bringing jobs home. It is time to make America secure, and it is time to secure our assets.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DREIER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REMARKS ON THE IRISH PEACE PROCESS

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. Madam Speaker, I rise this evening as we approach the St. Patrick's Day recess to remind this body of the continued struggle for peace and justice in the North of Ireland. For many in America of Irish ancestry, this is a time of celebration, as it should be. However, we must also recognize that the fight for freedom and equality on the island of Ireland is still being waged.

Tonight I want to remember and commemorate the 90th anniversary of the Easter Uprising and the proclamation of an Irish Republic at the General Post Office in 1916. The brave men and women who took up arms against England vowed to fight for religious and civil liberty, equal rights and equal opportunities for all Irish citizens.

This year also marks the 25th anniversary of the deaths of 10 brave men who died on a hunger strike in Long Kesh. Their courage and that of the women of Armagh inspired countless individuals and made the world take notice of the cruel and discriminatory policies of the British government in the North of Ireland. Their sacrifice proved the shortsightedness of a British policy criminalization.

Madam Speaker, I had the opportunity today to meet once again with Gerry Adams, whom I admire so much, for his continued determination to educate the Members of Congress about the situation in Northern Ireland. Because of the sacrifice of so many dedicated individuals like Gerry Adams over the years, we have seen great strides on the quest for an Ireland of equals.

The historic ceasefire by the IRA in 1994, followed by the Good Friday accords signed in 1998, created tremendous progression in the north. The

IRA's recent decision to lay down their weapons and pursue exclusively peaceful means toward the goal of a united Ireland is yet another hopeful sign.

However there still remains much to be done. The Good Friday agreement must be implemented in full. Any attempt to walk away from the institutions set forth in the agreement or substitute them with something less is a mistake. It is designed to placate extremists who want to fight progress and maintain their superiority. This simply cannot be allowed to stand.

Responsible leaders on all sides and on all parties must recognize that a quality in progress is inevitable and give the people of Northern Ireland the democracy that they deserve now.

Madam Speaker, I have consistently called for the full implementation of the Patten recommendations on policing because I believe true peace cannot exist without justice. This will not happen until there is a fair and impartial police service representative of all the communities in the North.

A dismantling of the British war machine in towns like South Armagh and Crosmaglen need to happen now so that residents there can live in peace and without fear of violence from a government supposedly there to protect them.

With a history of collusion between the RUC and loyalists paramilitaries, a full, complete and independent inquiry must also be done into if death of Pat Finucan, murdered by paramilitaries in front of his young family.

Madam Speaker, 25 years ago, as Bobby Sands sat in his cell on a hunger strike, he wrote in his diary, and I quote, if they aren't able to destroy the desire for freedom, they won't break you. They won't break me, because the desire for freedom and the freedom of the Irish people is in my heart. The day will dawn when all the people of Ireland will have the desire for freedom to show.

Madam Speaker, the British and Irish governments must recognize that the desire for freedom is as strong today as it ever was, and it will not be destroyed. The historic moves by the IRA and the electoral gains made by Sinn Fein are evidence of this desire. People will simply not tolerate a return to the conditions that have plagued the North for so many years.

PROTECTING THE CROWN JEWEL OF AMERICA'S SPACE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, last week was one of extraordinary triumph for the Nation's space program. On Thursday, NASA announced that the Cassini spacecraft may have found evidence of liquid water reservoirs that erupt in Yellowstone-Like geysers on Saturn's moon Enceladus. This stunning announcement was followed the next day by the successful orbital insertion of the Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter around the Red Planet.

I stand before the House today to celebrate these incredible technological achievements and wondrous scientific discoveries, but most of all, to honor those who made it possible, the men and women of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena, California.

JPL, which is managed for NASA by the California Institute of Technology, has designed, built and controlled many of America's most successful unmanned space craft. JPL has pioneered our exploration of space from Explorer 1, America's first satellite, to Ranger and Surveyor craft that paved the way for Apollo to the Voyager spacecraft that explore the outer planets and are still continuing to send back data even as they leave our solar system.

JPL missions have increased our comprehension beyond anything even contemplated half a century ago. Every American space probe that has visited another body our solar system was managed by JPL. Through the wonders of technology, we have circled Jupiter with Galileo, sampled a comet with Stardust and rolled across the surface of Mars with spirit and opportunity. Cassini, which has been orbiting Saturn for just over 18 months, has transmitted stunning photographs and invaluable data on Saturn and its moons, while the Mar's Reconnaissance Orbiter, which will begin its science mission later this year, is expected to transmit more information about Mars than all of our previous Mars missions combined.

□ 1900

JPL's spectacular missions have not only brought us incalculable scientific data; they have also sustained American's interest in space flight, especially the Mars missions.

Now, as NASA prepares to accelerate the development of the Crew Exploration Vehicle and moves forward with plans to return humans to the Moon, the space agency and Congress must take care to continue to provide adequate resources to support the robotic exploration of space that is JPL's specialty.

Over the past months, NASA has worked to put into place a comprehensive program aimed at realizing the President's goal of landing an American on Mars. This is an ambitious and worthy goal, but the technological and physiological challenges, not to mention the cost, mean that it may be decades before an American walks on the Martian surface.

In the interim, we can continue to explore the Red Planet and our neighbors with relatively inexpensive probes that are better equipped than humans to survive the extreme hardship of long-duration space travel.

Madam Speaker, as we consider the future of our space program, I urge NASA and my colleagues not to deprive JPL, one of the crown jewels of American science and technology, of adequate resources. The Mars program is one of the centerpieces of JPL's focus and the lab has several exciting missions planned for the next couple decades.

But even as JPL unlocks the secrets of our planetary neighbors, it is poised to begin an ambitious search for habitable worlds around the stars, a search that will help to answer one of humankind's oldest questions: Are we alone in the universe?

SIM PlanetQuest scheduled for launch in the middle of the next decade will precisely determine the distances to stars throughout our galaxy and will probe nearby stars for Earth-sized planets. SIM will open a window to a new world of discoveries.

The Mars program and SIM PlanetQuest are ambitious and resource-intensive missions with long lead times. JPL has also been a leading NASA center for the Explorer that in the past has offered opportunities to carry out small and medium-sized missions that can be developed and launched in a short timeframe.

The Explorer program engages academia, industry, NASA centers and government labs in strong partnerships that provide young engineers, scientists, and managers the opportunity to develop and gain valuable experience on missions from inception to launch.

Unfortunately, as a result of budget cuts over the last few years, this important program is quietly being phased out. But I believe that we must consider the significant and damaging effect this will have on NASA's scientific and technological program.

I am especially concerned about the recent decision to terminate the NuSTAR mission before its interim confirmation review. This action will have permanent damaging consequences as it is causing the scientific community as well as industry to question the reliability of NASA as a partner and the wisdom of investing internal resources in the proposal development process.

The termination calls NASA's commitment to the peer review selection process into serious question and illustrates, in my view, a lack of appreciation of the serious investment made by the team at NASA to date.

While I understand that NASA is facing difficult budgetary decisions, the priorities must be set, it would be a severe blow to NASA science to allow such a low-cost, productive, and unique program like Explorers to be so severely cut. In particular the unprecedented action taken with NuSTAR will have lasting consequences for all future competed missions.

Madam Speaker, the decisions we make this year will have profound implications for the future of America's space program. Even as we celebrate JPL's most recent successes, I urge NASA and my colleagues to work to ensure JPL's leadership in exploring our solar system and the Universe beyond.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). 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.)

UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO ALTERNATIVE SPRING BREAK GULF TRIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I am taping or putting up here a Web site that will help to pay tribute to over 200 students, professors, and other citizens from Ohio's universities, schools, and just citizens interested who traveled to the gulf in our country on an alternative spring break.

Called Rockets on the Road to Compassion, the University of Toledo's alternative spring break directed the efforts of over 200 Americans in helping the hurricane-ravaged areas of the gulf. To learn more about what they did and are doing, go to the Web site www.UTalternative springbreak. utoledo.edu. I will keep repeating that tonight.

From March 3 through March 11, these magnificent Americans traveled to Florida, Louisiana, Alabama, Texas, Mississippi, and Georgia. The UT chapter of Campus Crusade for Christ sent 65 students to Pass Christian, Mississippi, where Katrina's eye made landfall.

The UT's Catholic Student Association sent 20 students to help build homes in Ft. Walton Beach, Florida. Donovan Nichols, a University of Toledo graduate student and AmeriCorps VISTA volunteer, led coordination efforts for 104 participants spread across five locations devastated by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita: Bay St. Louis, Mississippi; Bayou LaBatre, Alabama; Orange, Texas; Lake Charles; as well as Metairie in Louisiana.

Organizers and chaperones included Dr. Celia Regimbal, tenured University of Toledo professor in health sciences, and Reverend Dee Baker, the director of the Toledo Campus Ministry on the campus. America thanks all of them.

The world can learn more about their journey by looking at their Web site, www.utalternative springbreak. utoledo.edu. Some of the hundreds and thousands and stories from the gulf are reflected by what they did.

We recall with them the words: America is only as great as she is good. I know that their goal is to help follow through on this journey, to tell other Americans what happened so they can follow suit and to help us as we continue relating to these communities.

Let me just read some of the excerpts on this blog. From Dr. Celia Regimbal, University of Toledo professor, assigned to Bay St. Louis, Mississippi. She says, it has taken 21 of us 3 days to remove siding and get felt paper up. How long would it take one person? How long would it take to replace your neighborhood?

There is not a house in Bay St. Louis and Waveland that has not suffered some damage. We are guessing that 30 percent of the homes are totally gone. It will take years to rebuild the coast. We cannot forget that the folks here will continue to need our help.

Terrance Teagarden, who was assigned to New Orleans, wrote: between the two crews we have got operating right now down here, we look to have two houses gutted and a decent start on two more. Three houses gutted by crews of about 10 in 4 days' time. At this rate, he says, it will take years to get things back to normal here.

I saw President Bush and his escort fly over on a helicopter yesterday morning before we began our work. I heard the President say at a press conference awhile back he would love to bring his family here. Not in this condition he would not. Mr. President, he says, please come down to the 9th Ward and work with us, or any crew of volunteers for one day. I guarantee you will think differently of the progress made.

Then the young man says, honestly, pointing fingers will not help anyone anymore right now. We need thousands, droves, of Americans staying in tents and parks and churches all over the gulf region just helping to gut, prepare for inspection, and rebuild houses.

Through all of this, it has been the efforts of grass-roots organizations that have really gotten things done. Right now there is a need for playground items such as Hula-Hoops, balls. Schools and churches also need supplies to rebuild.

Donovan Nichols, who was assigned to Lake Charles, Louisiana, said, prior to Hurricane Rita, this town of Cameron had a population of roughly 2,000 people clinging to the edge of the Gulf of Mexico. Now, aside from relief workers, the community is deserted. While working on the roof at the house in Starks, two separate individuals dropped by asking us for help.

They described how they were not eligible for any FEMA money, but they really needed help. They sent them to some local churches for help.

Mary Ellen Edwards in Bay St. Louis, Mississippi, says: our group here in Bay St. Louis spent part of yesterday and today helping a family of five who were trying to get their uninhabitable house cleaned up.

Madam Speaker, I know my time is expired, but I would like to place all of the remarks in the RECORD and ask the American people to look at www.utalternative springbreak. utoledo.edu Please help Ohioans rebuild the gulf.

Today we also helped out the whole community by cleaning the debris off of the beach. The community gets a reduction in the loans it has gotten from FEMA to help out the people in Hancock County for each hour of work volunteers do in beach clean up. Celia Regimbal set this up through the environmental staff person from Congressman GENE TAYLOR's office.

If the role of the government is to provide for the common good, the Federal Government just cannot seem to get much of a handle on this problem. Perhaps it is too worried about the media spin, its image, and pointing fingers than really working on solving the problem.

Imagine, by Neda Archie in Bay St. Louis, Mississippi:

Actually seeing the devastation has humbled me. The first day we drove through town I had no words. I felt every emotion possible to feel therefore I just looked with a kind of blank stare in disbelief. You don't know anything until you actually see it with your own eyes.

Imagine what is now trash and rubble used to be your prized possessions, your family photographs, your favorite pair of shoes, an old staircase from the house your family grew up in, and not your roof but your neighbors roof. Imagine trying to salvage and dry out a little piece of your life that existed before the devastation.

Imagine your schools you graduated from, the bridges you used to cross, the trees you used to climb, and the flowers that used to bloom are non-existent. Imagine losing some of your friends and loved ones. Imagine 75 percent of your town is gone.

Reflections by Danselle in Bay St. Louis, Mississippi:

These past few days have taught us all a valuable lesson, humility. This street was once where beach houses, mansions, and beautiful summer homes once dwelled. Now there's nothing but the Gulf. I expected to come down here and see at least a house fixture, but that's barely possible even 6 months later.

Most of the homes have been here for over 100 years, passed down through generations. These homes are extremely too expensive to replace, so most people have to settle with a home that's a lot cheaper.

The residents here in Bay St. Louis have experienced the absolute worst in wind damage, and were basically forgotten all about. We have been described as elephant biters. Katrina was like a big elephant dropped onto the entire coast, and we are here to bite chunks out of this elephant until it's completely gone.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to persons outside the Chamber.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCHENRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE IRAQ WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, this weekend will mark the third anniversary of the Iraq war, and I am still

wondering, more importantly the majority of the American people are wondering, why we went there, and what we are still doing there.

Remember, we were told this was going to be a walk in the park, in and out in a flash. A few thousand troops and a few million dollars, no sweat. Well, now it has been 3 years, and if we are not out by the end of this year, 2006, our troops will have been fighting in Iraq longer than their grandparents fought in World War II.

More than 2,300 Americans dead; tens of thousands wounded; tens of thousands, maybe even hundreds of thousands, of Iraqi civilians killed; over a quarter billion dollars spent, and for what? So we can lose all stature and credibility around the world? So we can give rise to an insurgency that shows no signs of abating? So we can inspire even greater hatred of the United States among violent jihadists in the Muslim world? Or so we can throw gasoline on the fire of sectarian strife in Iraq and further ignite a civil war?

Yesterday's Washington Post reports at least 86 bodies found in Iraq, many of them in a mass grave, many of them having been strangled or tortured. And today the biggest air offensive since the beginning of this mistake.

When is enough enough, Madam Speaker? How many more Presidential speeches? How many more half-baked platitudes about the march of freedom?

Just two days ago at George Washington University, the President said: ''The work ahead in Iraq is hard.'' But it was his administration that assured us 3 years ago of just the opposite, that this was going to be easy. ''We will complete the mission,'' he said yesterday. But in May 2003, he was declaring ''mission accomplished,'' in fact, draping an aircraft carrier with those very words.

The real tragedy is that our Nation will be living with this disastrous fallout from this war for generations. The money we have spent on this war is money we do not have and will not have for investments in our people, their health care, their education, their retirement, their job training, and, yes, their security.

The unspeakable, despicable acts of torture that took place at Abu Ghraib have robbed us of our moral authority. The very foundations of freedom have been threatened by the PATRIOT Act and the President's defiance of the rule of law on domestic surveillance.

The trumped-up weapons of mass destruction intelligence and the fabrication about an Iraqi link to 9/11 have damaged the trust between America and its leaders, trust that is critical to a thriving democracy.

And on a very basic human level, what about men and women who come back from Iraq shattered by the experience? Even if they make it home with all of their limbs functioning and intact, what about the psychological demons that come home with them?

These brave patriots need medical help if they are going to lead a productive civilian life, but according to a recent study by the military, they are not getting it.

□ 1915

Although one-third of returning Iraq and Afghanistan veterans are seeking mental health services, the great majority of those who are diagnosed with psychiatric problems are going untreated.

A lot of damage has been done, Madam Speaker, and there is a lot of work ahead: work to repair our troops, our principles, and our reputation. But there is one thing we could do right now to stem the tide, to contain the damage, to literally stop the bleeding. We could and we should bring our troops home now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. FOXX addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. VAN HOLLEN 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 Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BISHOP of Utah 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 Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EMANUEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SAVING LIVES THROUGH LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I came here to Washington to do everything I could to reduce gun violence in this country; and unfortunately, the atmosphere that is here is preventing me from doing that.

There are many out there that say I am out there to try to take away the right of someone to own a gun, and yet I have never introduced any kind of legislation that would do any such thing.

What I am trying to do is save lives. What I am trying to do is certainly try to keep medical costs down. We have come to an agreement, many Members in this Chamber, on legislation I introduced a couple of years ago. The reason behind this legislation was because, unfortunately, there was another shooting in my district and two of my parishioners were killed. And the sad story is it could have been prevented.

Peter Troy, who is someone that had a very long mental health background, and he also had a restraining order from his mother against him because of his violent acts, was able to go into a store and legally buy a gun. He was able to do this because the State, my State of New York, did not put the information into the State system that was supposed to go into the NICS system.

This is happening every single day across this Nation. We looked into it and figured how can we change this. So we started looking at the different States. We saw that some States hardly had any records in the NICS system that had anything to do with domestic violence. We saw also that many States did not put anything in on those that were convicted of felonies. So we came up with legislation that we thought would help to reduce crime in this country.

We came up with legislation that we knew if we could keep guns out of illegal hands, those that should not be able to buy a gun, we could save lives. And if we could save lives, we are hoping also we could save injuries, and this way it is a win-win situation for everyone in our community.

I am hoping before the Memorial Day recess that I will be able to get my legislation back on to the floor for a vote. It did pass in 1997, and we had it on a voice vote because everybody agreed with it.

Now, I know our time down here is very short. We are going on another break this very week. For the 10 years that I have been here in Washington, we have never had a break in March. I wish we could be staying so we could continue to work to do the people's work.

I guess what I want to talk about is that we could have reasonable laws that could help people, save people's lives and make a difference in someone's life. We can do this without certainly infringing on anyone's second amendment rights.

The NICS bill that I am proposing would help our States bring their data up to speed. We all know that computers and the Internet are moving very rapidly, but a computer is only as good as the information in it. What I propose, and what had been accepted here in this House, would give the States the money so that when someone is convicted of a crime that would make them ineligible to be able to buy a gun, that would immediately go into the system. This is a win-win situation for everyone.

Back in my State of New York we are seeing more and more illegal guns coming into my city. It is probably happening in a lot of other States. It is only a small percentage of those bad people that are buying these illegal guns that we can stop.

Madam Speaker, there are so many things we could do to stop gun violence in this country, to make a difference. And I know it is not on the top of the list of everybody in this country. I know the majority of people are struggling to just get through their day, working, coming home, taking care of the family, doing everything that a family should be doing because they honestly feel that we as politicians are down here protecting them.

We talk about homeland security. We talk about possible terrorists in this country, and yet we make it so easy for those out there to buy guns.

Madam Speaker, I hope we can make a difference. I hope we can change the dialogue. I hope we can save lives. I hope we can prevent injuries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California 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 Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio 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 Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCDERMOTT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. DELAURO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MCKINNEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

BRAIN AWARENESS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Madam Speaker, today I rise to acknowledge Brain Awareness Week, which reminds us that neuroscience research is critical to the health of U.S. global competitiveness and much of this research is done by the National Institutes of Health.

As Members of Congress, many of us from both sides of the aisle make a commitment to doubling the NIH budget, and many of us now wonder what do we get for what we paid for.

Some are asking this and I have asked them to look at www.SFN.org, which stands for the Society of Neuroscience which has produced 24 separate brain research success stories. Behind me here you see some of the incredible technology that is giving rise to research in the brain by helping us through PET scans and FMRIs, looking into the brain as we have never been able to do before.

These discoveries have allowed us to develop treatments that reduce the severity of symptoms for those suffering from Parkinson's, those suffering from affective disorders. We have seen a whole new class of anti-depressants that produce fewer sides effects than their predecessors. We have also seen great breakthroughs in the identification of new stroke treatment and prevention methods, and we have seen the creation of ways to help prevent epileptic seizures, as well as expansion of treatments for psychotic symptoms and schizophrenia. Research brings hope and improves the lives of millions of Americans.

Madam Speaker, in this country mental illnesses comprise the second leading cause of lost work days in our country. Suicide in this country is twice the rate of homicide. We lose 34,000 people a year to suicide. The fact of the matter is we have 1,300 young people every single day who try to take their lives in this country. And yet we can reach into this brain science, find and discover ways to help reduce the severity of mental illness and address the needs that people have that cause them to suffer so greatly.

Madam Speaker, I would just point once again to the fact that we have had technology thanks to the National Institutes of Mental Health, the National Institute of Drug Addiction, the National Institute of Alcoholism that has demonstrated to us that we are going to see great promise. But we need the American people to call their Members of Congress and say to their Members of Congress, we want full funding for mental health research and neuroscience.

We have come too far to step back now. Anybody watching this program needs to call their Members of Congress, their Senator and their Representative, and say we do not want to take a step backward in brain research. We want us to go forward to help solve the many mysteries of the brain and the suffering that is going out around this country from those who are suffering from mental illness.

Madam Speaker, we also need them to ask for parity for mental health coverage, which means equal insurance coverage for mental illness as every other physical illness. You cannot look at these poster boards and not tell me that mental illness is physical illness.

It is not a sign of a character defect if they are depressed, if they are suffering from mental illness. It is a sign that they need the kind of attention to the organ, which is their brain, the organ which is their brain that too often has been associated with stigma and stereotype that has guided our policymaking too much of the time; and as a result we spend less than four of every 100 of your dollars at NIH studying brain diseases even though they comprise the second leading cause of lost days in this country.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing Brain Awareness Week and join me in helping to continue the research, the very promising work that is going on in our institutes of health that help us find the discoveries that we need in order to relieve the suffering of millions of Americans.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. DAVIS of California (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of illness.

Mr. SHIMKUS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today after 3:00 p.m. on account of overseeing elections in Belarus.

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. DEFAZIO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. POE) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

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

H.J. Res. 47. Joint resolution increasing the statutory limit on the public debt.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of today, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Accordingly, pursuant to the previous order of the House of today, the House stands adjourned until noon on Monday, March 20, 2006, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 361, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

Thereupon (at 7 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), pursuant to the previous order of the House of today, the House adjourned until noon on Monday, March 20, 2006, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 361, 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:

6721. A letter from the Administrator, FSIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Changes in Fees for Meat, Poultry, and Egg Products Inspection Services—Fiscal Years 2006-2008 [Docket No. 03-027F; FDMS Docket Number FSIS-2005-0025] (RIN: 0583-AD12) received February 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6722. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Add Kazakhstan, Romania, Russia, Turkey, and Ukraine to List of Regions in Which Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza Subtype H5N1 is Considered to Exist [Docket No. APHIS-2006-0010] received February 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6723. A letter from the Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—TRICARE; Revision of Participating Providers Reimbursement Rate; TRICARE Dental Program (TDP) [DOD-2006-OS-002] (RIN: 0720-AA92) received February 22, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6724. A letter from the Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Delegation of Insuring Authority to Direct Endorsement Mortgages; Announcement of Information Collection Effective Date [Docket No. FR-4169-F-04] (RIN: 2502-AG87) received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6725. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Federal Reserve Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Risk-Based Capital Guidelines; Market Risk Measure; Securities Borrowing Transactions [Regulation H and Y; Docket No. R-1087] received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6726. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Revised Regulations Governing Small Power Production and Cogeneration Facilities [Docket No. RM05-36-000; Order No. 671) received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6727. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Microbiology Devices; Reclassification of Hepatitis A Virus Serological Assays [Docket No. 2003P-0564] received February 28, 2006], pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6728. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Clarification to the Export Administration Regulations; General Order to Implement the Syria Accountability and Lebanese Sovereignty Act [Docket No. 051230351-5351-01] (RIN: 0694-AD68) received February 22, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

6729. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-293, ''DC-USA Economic Development Act of 2006,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6730. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General for Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Privacy Act of 1974; Implementation [AAG/A Order No. 004-2006] received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6731. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General for Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Privacy Act of 1974; Implementation [AAG/A Order No. 019-2005] received January 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6732. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Termination of Federal Enforcement for Parts of the Misssouri Permanent Regulatory Program and Return of Full Regulatory Authority to the State of Missouri [Docket No. MO-738] received January 26, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6733. A letter from the Director, NIST, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Summer Undergraduate Research Fellowships (SURF) Gaithersburg and Boulder Programs; Availability of Funds [Docket No. 051222346-5346-01] received February 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

6734. A letter from the Office of Regulations Policy and Management, VBA, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Dependency and Indemnity Compensation: Surving Spouse's Rate; Payments Based on Veteran's Entitlement to Compensation for Service-Connected Disability Rated Totally Disabling for Specified Periods Prior to Death (RIN: 2900-AL86) received February 1, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

6735. A letter from the Assistant Director, Directives and Regulations Branch, Office of Regulatory and Management Services, USDA Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use (RIN: 0596-AC11) received January 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Resources.

6736. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Medicare Program; Medicare Secondary Payer Amendments [CMS-6272-IFC] (RIN: 0938-AN27) received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and 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. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4709. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen protections for law enforcement officers and the public by providing criminal penalties for the fraudulent acquisition or unauthorized disclosure of phone records (Rept. 109–395). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia: Supplementary Report and Document Annex by the Select Bipartisan Committee to Investigate the Preparation for and Response to Hurricane Katrina (Rept. 109–396). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HUNTER: Committee on Armed Services. House Resolution 685. Resolution requesting the President and directing the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in their possession relating to any entity with which the United States has contracted for public relations purposes concerning Iraq; adversely (Rept. 109–397). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KIRK:

H.R. 4972. A bill to permit certain school districts in Illinois to be reconstituted for purposes of determining assistance under the Impact Aid program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 4973. A bill to restore the financial solvency of the national flood insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HYDE (for himself and Mr. LANTOS) (both by request):

H.R. 4974. A bill to authorize the President to waive the application of certain requirements under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 with respect to India; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. DREIER (for himself, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington):

H.R. 4975. A bill to provide greater transparency with respect to lobbying activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, Rules, Government Reform, and Standards of Official Conduct, 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. FLAKE):

H.R. 4976. A bill to reiterate that chapters 119 and 121 of title 18, United States Code, and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 are the exclusive means by which domestic electronic surveillance may be conducted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (for herself, Mr. HALL, Mr. REYES, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BACA, and Mr. ORTIZ):

H.R. 4977. A bill to place a 2-year moratorium on certain contracts to conduct port operations in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on International Relations, 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 Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 4978. A bill to require the Comptroller General to conduct a study on the extent to which security operations at United States seaports are managed by nationals of foreign countries and other related matters; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PICKERING:

H.R. 4979. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to clarify the preference for local firms in the award of certain contracts for disaster relief activities; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BASS (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 4980. A bill to allow employees of Federally-qualified health centers to obtain health coverage under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. KUHL of New York (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE):

H.R. 4981. A bill to amend the National Dam Safety Program Act; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. BEAN:

H.R. 4982. A bill to improve public awareness in the United States regarding safe use of the Internet through the establishment of an Office of Internet Safety and Public Awareness within the Federal Trade Commission; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 4983. A bill to recognize the exemplary service of the National Guard in Iraq and to direct the President to begin the redeployment of United States military forces from Iraq, starting with National Guard units; to the Committee on International Relations, 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.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4984. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to enhance the protection of credit ratings of active duty military personnel who are activated for military service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HULSHOF):

H.R. 4985. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the employment tax treatment and reporting of wages paid by professional employer organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 4986. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Transportation to prioritize maritime transportation security grants based on the risks and vulnerabilities of ports and the proximity of ports to critical infrastructure or urban or sensitive areas; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. HAYES:

H.R. 4987. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide an increased maximum penalty for telemarketing fraud targeting seniors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Government Reform, 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. HEFLEY (for himself, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BEAUPREZ, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

H.R. 4988. A bill to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to strengthen the ethics process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committees on Standards of Official Conduct, 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. HOLT:

H.R. 4989. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to clarify the treatment of provisional ballots cast in elections for Federal office, to ensure that polling places are adequately staffed and have sufficient equipment, to direct States to issue durable voter registration cards to each individual who registers to vote in elections for Federal office in the State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 4990. A bill to provide for the establishment by the Secretary of Energy of a program of Federal support for local governments that establish Clean Energy Bond Acts; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JEFFERSON (for himself, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FORD, Mr. WATT, Mr. OWENS, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 4991. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out a program to temporarily make payments under residential mortgage loans for properties significantly damaged by Hurricane Katrina; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. KELLY (for herself and Mr. BASS):

H.R. 4992. A bill to provide for Medicare reimbursement for health care services provided to Medicare-eligible veterans in facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KIND, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. STARK, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 4993. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to enhance the Social Security of the Nation by ensuring adequate public-private infrastructure and to resolve to prevent, detect, treat, intervene in, and prosecute elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, 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. LEWIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 4994. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to exempt complex rehabilitation products and assistive technology products from the Medicare competitive acquisition program; 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 Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WEINER, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. NADLER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. REYNOLDS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 4995. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7

Columbus Avenue in Tuckahoe, New York, as the ''Ronald Bucca Post Office''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself and Mr. BISHOP of New York):

H.R. 4996. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend the employer subsidy payment provisions under the Medicare prescription drug program to State Pharmaceutical Assistance Programs; 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. MORAN of Kansas (for himself and Mr. POMEROY):

H.R. 4997. A bill to permanently authorize amendments made by the Immigration and Nationality Technical Corrections Act of 1994 for the purpose of permitting waivers of the foreign country residence requirement with respect to certain international medical graduates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania (for herself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. FARR, Mr. WU, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. STARK, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 4998. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to protect disaster assistance employee reservists when activated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency for work at a specific disaster site from termination or demotion in their places of employment; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SHAYS (for himself and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 4999. A bill to enhance security and protect against terrorist attacks at chemical facilities; to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. SHAYS (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. CASE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. STARK, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 5000. A bill to amend the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 with respect to the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, the Judiciary, Homeland Security, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. SIMMONS (for himself and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California):

H.R. 5001. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to enhance homeland security information sharing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. SIMMONS (for himself and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California):

H.R. 5002. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for information sharing partnerships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. SIMMONS (for himself and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California):

H.R. 5003. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for the full and efficient use of open-source intelligence; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. SIMMONS (for himself and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California):

H.R. 5004. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for an Office of Intelligence and Analysis and an Office of Infrastructure Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 5005. A bill to make technical changes to Federal firearms laws and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SOLIS:

H.R. 5006. A bill to designate certain public land as wilderness and certain rivers as wild and scenic rivers in the State of California, to designate Salmon Restoration Areas, to establish the Sacramento River National Recreation Area and Ancient Bristlecone Pine Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Ms. SOLIS:

H.R. 5007. A bill to require the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide mental health services in languages other than English, as needed, for veterans and family members with limited English proficiency, to expand the scope of mental health services provided to family members of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALDEN of Oregon:

H.R. 5008. A bill to authorize the Under Secretary of Technology of the Department of Commerce to award grants to establish up to eight Nanoscience to Commercialization Institutes throughout the United States to develop commercial applications for nanotechnology; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, 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. WELDON of Florida (for himself and Mr. SOUDER):

H.R. 5009. A bill to reauthorize the HIV Health Care Services Program under title XXVI of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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 Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico (for herself, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. OTTER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 5010. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the credit for electricity produced from certain renewable resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WOOLSEY:

H.R. 5011. A bill to award posthumously a congressional gold medal to John Pehle in recognition of his contributions to the Nation in helping rescue Jews and other minorities from the Holocaust during World War II; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H. Con. Res. 359. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H. Con. Res. 360. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 362. Concurrent resolution congratulating Prime Minister Portia Simpson-Miller for becoming the first democratically-elected female Prime Minister of Jamaica and the first female head of state; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. FOSSELLA (for himself and Ms. ESHOO):

H. Con. Res. 363. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Health and Human Services should promulgate as expeditiously as possible regulations required under the Public Health Service Act, relating to protections for residents of certain facilities with respect to the use of restraints and involuntary seclusion; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. LYNCH):

H. Con. Res. 364. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of St. Patrick's Day; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. FARR, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. BONO, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. CASE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TANNER, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. KELLER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SHAW, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BAKER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. MCINTYRE):

H. Res. 729. A resolution supporting National Tourism Week; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. REYES, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mrs. CAPITO):

H. Res. 730. A resolution recognizing the efforts and contributions of The Women's Museum: An Institute for the Future; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. TANNER, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. RYUN of Kansas):

H. Res. 731. A resolution commending the Patriot Guard Riders for shielding mourning

military families from protesters and preserving the memory of fallen service members at funerals; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 732. A resolution congratulating the Public Broadcasting Service as it celebrates the 15th anniversary season of the nationally televised broadcast program, Public Broadcasting Service's To The Contrary, with Bonnie Erbe; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Ms. HART, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H. Res. 733. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that there should be established an Irish-American Heritage Month; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. ENGEL):

H. Res. 734. A resolution calling on the Government of the United Kingdom to immediately establish a full, independent, public judicial inquiry into the murder of Northern Ireland defense attorney Pat Finucane, as recommended by international Judge Peter Cory as part of the Weston Park agreement and a way forward for the Northern Ireland Peace Process; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. WOOLSEY (for herself, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. SOLIS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. SIMMONS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. FARR, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. WATSON, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. OLVER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. HERSETH, Ms. BEAN, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. CASE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. SABO, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. OWENS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois):

H. Res. 735. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the ''Additional Clarification of Intercollegiate Athletics Policy: Three-Part Test-part Three'', issued by the United States Department of Education without notice or opportunity for public comment on March 17, 2005, is inconsistent with longstanding Department policies and fundamental principles of equality, is a disservice to our Nation's young women, and should be withdrawn by the Department of Education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Ms. WATERS introduced a bill (H.R. 5012) for the relief of Rafael Camacho, Rosa B. Camacho, and Rosa Camacho; 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. 23: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 25: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 115: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 269: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 354: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 363: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 376: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 475: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FILNER, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 503: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 517: Mr. BONNER.
H.R. 552: Mr. SHADEGG.
H.R. 717: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 735: Mr. FILNER, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 791: Ms. HARMAN.
H.R. 792: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 819: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
H.R. 857: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 916: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 964: Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. BOEHLERT.
H.R. 1070: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
H.R. 1106: Mr. MOORE of Kansas and Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 1298: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 1306: Mr. ROSS and Mr. CARDOZA.
H.R. 1310: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1329: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 1402: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1451: Mr. REYES, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 1498: Ms. BEAN.
H.R. 1545: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 1578: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. FLAKE, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.
H.R. 1588: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 1598: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 1639: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1807: Mr. REYES, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1950: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.
H.R. 1951: Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 2059: Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 2231: Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2317: Ms. SOLIS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 2358: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 2369: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CARDOZA, and Mr. OBEY.
H.R. 2386: Mr. MCKEON, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. CAMP of Michigan.
H.R. 2592: Mr. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 2683: Mr. ETHERIDGE.
H.R. 2684: Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 2793: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 2811: Mr. PASTOR and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 2943: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3127: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 3159: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BONNER, Mr. FORD, and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 3164: Mrs. KELLY and Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 3265: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 3352: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H.R. 3361: Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3385: Mr. WELLER and Mr. CHOCOLA.
H.R. 3413: Mr. WALSH.
H.R 3559: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BERRY, Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. JENKINS.
H.R. 3628: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin and Mr. RENZI.
H.R. 3644: Mr. SPRATT and Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 3779: Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. CARSON, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CARNAHAN and Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 3861: Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 3883: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SULLIVAN and Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 3907: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia and Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 4030: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 4063: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 4067: Mr. EVANS and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 4085: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 4092: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
H.R. 4098: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. WALSH.
H.R. 4140: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 4186: Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan.
H.R. 4226: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 4239: Mr. BEAUPREZ.
H.R. 4318: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BUYER, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. ISSA, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 4341: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.
H.R. 4371: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H.R. 4409: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FILNER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 4450: Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 4465: Ms. HARMAN, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 4511: Mr. RAMSTAD and Mr. BEAUPREZ.
H.R. 4542: Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 4547: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.
H.R. 4551: Mr. JENKINS.
H.R. 4562: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 4574: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 4603: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 4651: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 4657: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 4681: Mr. JINDAL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. BONO, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. MCHUGH,
Mr. KIRK, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mr. GINGREY.
H.R. 4683: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 4685: Mr. HONDA and Mr. BERRY.
H.R. 4725: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HALL, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 4737: Mr. OWENS and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 4740: Mr. COSTA, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 4755: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 4760: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4761: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. GINGREY.
H.R. 4773: Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 4813: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 4830: Mr. HERGER and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 4834: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 4859: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4867: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WU, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. OLVER, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 4874: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. BOYD, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. EDWARDS, and Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 4881: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 4890: Mr. COOPER, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 4899: Mr. HOYER and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 4900: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H. R. 4902: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BONNER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FORTUÑO, Ms. HART, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LEE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. OTTER, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. POE, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELLER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. AKIN, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. REGULA, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BACA, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DENT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. RENZI, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 4904: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 4914: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 4915: Mr. MCNULTY and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 4945: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 4946: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 4949: Mr. FORBES, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 4950: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 4953: Mr. DINGELL and Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 4956: Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. NADLER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.J. Res. 78: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 179: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.

H. Con. Res. 282: Mr. LANTOS.

H. Con. Res. 318: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. NADLER.

H. Con. Res. 340: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H. Con. Res. 346: Mr. CUELLAR and Mr. PENCE.

H. Con. Res. 348: Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H. Con. Res. 357: Mr. BAIRD, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. DICKS.

H. Res. 116: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H. Res. 521: Mrs. KELLY and Mr. RUSH.

H. Res. 526: Mr. PENCE.

H. Res. 544: Mr. PAUL and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H. Res. 686: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. CARSON, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SABO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. DINGELL.

H. Res. 691: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H. Res. 701: Mr. BASS.

H. Res. 703: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H. Res. 719: Mr. MCHUGH.

H. Res. 723: Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H. Res. 728: Mr. PITTS.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 3 by Mr. EDWARDS on House Resolution 271: Maxine Waters and Robert A. Brady.

Petition 4 by Ms. SLAUGHTER on House Resolution 460: Robert A. Brady.

Petition 5 by Mr. WAXMAN on House Resolution 537: Robert A. Brady.

Petition 6 by Mr. ABERCROMBIE on House Resolution 543: Robert A. Brady and Elijah E. Cummings.

Petition 7 by Ms. HERSETH on House Resolution 568: Charles A. Gonzalez, Maxine Waters, Robert A. Brady, Cynthia McKinney, Rush D. Holt, Brian Baird, and Ed Case.

Petition 8 by Mr. WAXMAN on House Resolution 570: Charles A. Gonzalez, Maxine Waters, Robert A. Brady, Cynthia McKinney, Rush D. Holt, Brian Baird, and Jim Davis.

Petition 9 by Mr. BOSWELL on House Resolution 584; Maxine Waters, Stephen F. Lynch, Richard E. Neal, William D. Delahunt, John T. Salazar, Joseph Crowley, Bobby L. Rush, Ron Kind, Charles B. Rangel, Earl Pomeroy, Chaka Fattah, Tim Ryan, David Wu, Jose E. Serrano, David R. Obey, Jerry F. Costello, Edolphus Towns, Luis V. Gutierrez, Maurice D. Hinchey, Xavier Becerra, Michael E. Capuano, Edward J. Markey, Robert A. Brady, Anthony D. Weiner, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Howard L. Berman, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Lincoln Davis, Robert Wexler, Carolyn C. Kilpatrick, Diana DeGette, George Miller, Chet Edwards, Michael M. Honda, Emanuel Cleaver, Adam B. Schiff, Loretta Sanchez, Rosa L. DeLauro, Steve Israel, Robert E. (Bud) Cramer, Jr., Bart Gordon, Melvin L. Watt, Nita M. Lowey, Chris Van Hollen, Ed Case, Robert E. Andrews, David Scott, Jim Davis, Ike Skelton, Gene Taylor, Ted Strickland, James L. Oberstar, Alan B. Mollohan, Norman D. Dicks, Kendrick B. Meek, and Ed Pastor.

Petition 10 by Ms. HERSETH on House Resolution 585: Maxine Waters, Stephen F. Lynch, Richard E. Neal, John T. Salazar, William D. Delahunt, Joseph Crowley, Bobby L. Rush, Jim Cooper, Ron Kind, Charles B. Rangel, Earl Pomeroy, Chaka Fattah, Tim Ryan, David Wu, Jose E. Serrano, David R. Obey, Jerry F. Costello, Luis V. Gutierrez, Anthony D. Weiner, Henry Cuellar, Maurice D. Hinchey, Xavier Becerra, Michael E. Capuano, Edward J. Markey, Robert A. Brady, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Howard L. Berman, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Zoe Lofgren, Lincoln Davis, Robert Wexler, Mike McIntyre, Carolyn C. Kilpatrick, Diana DeGette, George Miller, Chet Edwards, Michael M. Honda, Emanuel Cleaver, Adam B. Schiff, Loretta Sanchez, Rosa L. DeLauro, Robert E. (Bud) Cramer, Jr., Bart Gordon, Melvin L. Watt, Brian Baird, Sander M. Levin, Nita M. Lowey, Ed Case, Robert E. Andrews, William J. Jefferson, Jim Davis, Ike Skelton, Gene Taylor, Ted Strickland, James L. Oberstar, Alan B. Mollohan, Norman D. Dicks, and Ed Pastor.

Petition 11 by Mr. BARROW on House Resolution 614: Charles A. Gonzalez, Maxine Waters, Benjamin L. Cardin, William J. Jefferson, Dan Boren, Maurice D. Hinchey, Daniel Lipinski, Cynthia McKinney, James E. Clyburn, Zoe Lofgren, Edolphus Towns, Carolyn C. Kilpatrick, Luis V. Gutierrez, Melissa L. Bean, Loretta Sanchez, Earl Pomeroy, Robert Wexler, John Conyers, Jr., Brian Baird, Mark Udall, James L. Oberstar, Robert E. Andrews, Gregory W. Meeks, Richard E. Neal, Jim Costa, Tim Holden, Diane E. Watson, Jim Davis, Ike Skelton, Gene Taylor, Marcy Kaptur, John T. Salazar, David Wu, Nick J. Rahall, II, Alan B. Mollohan, and Norman D. Dicks.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 4939

OFFERED BY: MS. MILLENDER-MCDONALD

AMENDMENT NO. 38: Page 59, line 1, insert ''(increased by $50,000,000)'' after the dollar figure.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 16, 2006 No. 34

Senate

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 15, 2006)

The Senate met at 9 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

God of lights, who into chaotic darkness commanded brightness, shine into our world with the fullness of Your love. Illuminate our minds so we will be Your ambassadors.

Empower our Senators to release reconciliation forces that will bring harmony and concord.

Bless our world leaders, who agonize for strategies that will bring sanity during insane times. Help them to remember that there is no time when You will fail us and no moment when we do not need You.

Bless, also, our military people who have left home and homeland to sacrifice for freedom. Keep their families and loved ones secure in Your love.

We pray in Your sovereign Name. Amen.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore 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.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 83, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 83) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2007 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 and 2008 through 2011.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time from 9 a.m. to 10:30 a.m. shall be evenly divided between the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. GREGG, and the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. CONRAD.

Pending:

Specter amendment No. 3048, to increase the advance appropriations allowance in order to fund health, education and training, and low-income programs.

Reid (for Clinton/Reid) amendment No. 3115, to increase funding in fiscal year 2007 by $347 million to restore funding or provide increased funding over fiscal year 2006 for programs and policies that support the delivery of contraceptive services and medically accurate information in order to reduce the number of unintended pregnancies, including Title X of the Public Health Service Act, and to restore funding or provide increased funding over fiscal year 2006 for programs that help women have healthy pregnancies and healthy children, including the Child Care Development Block Grant, Maternal and Child Health Block Grant, Healthy Start, and the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children paid for by closing corporate tax loopholes.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, this morning we are returning to the budget resolution for what we hope will be the final day. Chairman GREGG and Senator CONRAD will be managing the time until 10:30 a.m. At 10:30, we have an order for a series of four stacked votes. The first two are on the debt limit extension, and the last two votes are in relation to the avian flu amendments to the budget resolution. The two managers will then control the remaining time until 1:30 this afternoon when all time expires.

At 1:30 today, we begin disposing of the pending amendments and any additional amendments that are offered. This is the beginning of the so-called vote-arama. This is a difficult process. These votes will likely continue for a while today and possibly into the evening. I urge my colleagues to remain in or around the Chamber.

I was talking to the Democratic manager, and we both agreed, as does the Republican manager, that our colleagues must and we encourage them to show restraint during the day and recognize not every amendment needs to be offered. Yesterday, Senators missed some votes because they did not show up on time. The managers will be very clear in terms of how much time is allowed for each vote. We encourage Members to stay close to the Chamber so they do not miss the votes. The only way to finish the budget is to have that discipline and not to drag the votes on for 15 minutes or more. I also encourage Members to rethink whether they need to offer their amendments, as I stated earlier.

Finally, I note that we have some nominations to consider before we adjourn. On the list of nominations are two district judges we will finish. If votes are needed, then we will need to schedule those votes with the budget votes as well. However, I hope we can work on a nominations list that will be agreed to by unanimous consent.

I thank Senator GREGG and Senator CONRAD for their efforts so far. I thank everyone in advance for their patience during this budget process.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3133

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I am offering an amendment on avian flu. I offered this same amendment in the committee because after testimony by Secretary Leavitt before the Committee on the Budget, we are clearly still unprepared to meet any potential pandemic.

Here is what the U.N. said on March 9:

''Bird flu is likely to spread to birds in the United States within six months and could produce an epidemic among humans 'at any time,' said a U.N. official. The prediction by David Nabarro was the first by a top global health official pinpointing when birds carrying the flu will arrive in the lower 48 States.''

He went on to say, and I hope my colleagues and their staffs are listening:

''There will be a pandemic sooner or later,'' Nabarro said. ''It could start any time. We have a virus capable of replicating inside humans. We have a virus that humans are not resistant to. We have a virus about which we don't understand everything.''

The administration's assessment of what could happen if there were a pandemic is truly sobering. I will discuss the Bush administration estimates of possible consequences from avian flu pandemic. In terms of illness, if it were severe, 90 million people could be affected in this country. The requirement for outpatient medical care: 45 million people.

Colleagues, we are totally unprepared for something of this magnitude.

Hospitalization, if it were severe, 9.9 million people in this country would require hospitalization. ICU care—that is intensive care—almost 1.5 million people would need intensive care. We do not have the ventilators, we do not have the facilities, and we do not have the beds to accommodate that level of illness. Mechanical ventilation, almost 750,000 people would require ventilation. Again, we simply are not prepared for that.

And most sobering of all are the deaths. They anticipate in this country alone almost 2 million people could die.

Right now, the death rate is running far above that. We know, for everyone who has been diagnosed with this illness, roughly half are dying. Because these viruses tend to burn out, we would not get that same effect if we have a widespread outbreak, but nonetheless the potential is truly sobering. Again, we are not prepared.

Local communities will require Federal assistance if a pandemic strikes. This is from the director of public health in Seattle in King County, WA, as quoted in the USA Today on February 21, of this year:

Our hospitals and our public health system are funded for normal levels of operation . . . but have always relied on the federal government should we have need for more ventilators, for example, in the event of an earthquake or other mass-fatality event. ''What the federal planners are not getting,'' she says, ''is that if there is a pandemic, every community will be asking for ventilators from the national stockpile at the same time.''

Clearly she has that right. We are not prepared.

The Secretary said in his testimony before the Committee on the Budget that what is different about a pandemic is that it happens everywhere at once. You do not have the option of dealing with a few hotspots.

It is very clear we need more resources. What we most need additional resources for is to develop vaccines. We also need antivirals and more resources for public health. But clearly the top priority has to be developing vaccines that can safeguard people against this illness.

Here is the summary of our situation with respect to vaccines. We have limited vaccine production capacity, relying on only three companies. The bird flu virus is mutating, making current vaccines less effective. Current vaccine production is egg based and could be threatened by bird flu itself. That is a very important point. The way they make vaccine now, they use eggs, but of course the eggs are in the bird population. This is a bird flu. The population we would currently count on to produce vaccine may itself be threatened.

Finally, we need alternative technologies, since companies have few incentives to build expensive cell-based production facilities.

Mr. President and colleagues, it is very clear we cannot rely on eggs. Currently, there is not the production of the number of eggs to produce a max vaccine in a rapid way. So we have to move to a cell-based technology. But companies have few incentives to build these expensive cell-based production facilities unless they are guaranteed there is going to be a market.

The amendment I am offering would increase funding by $5 billion to combat an avian flu pandemic and increase local preparedness. The amendment would distribute that money as follows—this is based on testimony before the committee and our own outreach to the scientific community—an additional $1.5 billion to increase the stockpile of antivirals and necessary medical supplies, including masks, gloves, ventilators, antibiotics, and ongoing medical treatment needs for chronic-care patients.

With respect to antivirals, we know by the end of this year we are slated to have some 20 million courses of treatment of Tamiflu. The administration's goal is 80 million. So we are well short of having the necessary stockpiles of the antiviral Tamiflu. Clearly, we need more resources there. Clearly, we need more resources for ventilators. We already heard public health officials say that will be one place where there will be an extreme shortage should we face a pandemic.

Next, the amendment provides $2.5 billion to accelerate vaccine research, development, and manufacturing. And finally, it provides $1 billion to increase State and local preparedness. The amendment also ensures that the additional funding is fully offset, completely paid for.

I hope very much my colleagues will support this amendment. I know there is a resistance on the other side to increasing the top-line spending number. If there were ever a time to make an investment in protecting America, this is it. We could face the tragedy of our time.

I am reading a book called ''The Great Influenza.'' It is about the 1918 flu epidemic in which they estimate 50 to 100 million people died in this world. We have not had a pandemic since. Pandemics typically occur every 50 years or so, so we are well overdue. We did have a widespread, very severe flu in 1968.

The Secretary says we are not prepared, says we are not ready. Local health officials say we are not ready. International health officials say we are not ready. I hope very much we get ready and make this investment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator OBAMA, Senator CLINTON, Senator DURBIN, and Senator SCHUMER be added as cosponsors of this amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. Finally, the Senator from North Carolina, Mr. BURR, will have an amendment that will be considered at the same time as mine. His amendment is an empty vessel. Mr. President, let me send my amendment to the desk. I am sensing they do not have a copy there.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD], for himself, Mr. OBAMA, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. SCHUMER, proposes an amendment numbered 3133.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase funding to combat avian flu, increase local preparedness, and create a Manhattan Project-like effort to develop a vaccine to inoculate the U.S. Population against a pandemic by $5 billion in FY 2007 paid for by requiring tax withholding on government payments to contractors like Halliburton)

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $5,100,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $5,100,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $200,000,000.
On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $200,000,000.
On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $200,000,000.
On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by $5,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $2,800,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $800,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $300,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $4,100,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, decrease the amount by $2,700,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $200,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $4,100,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $1,400,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $800,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $700,000,000.
On page 6, line 16, decrease the amount by $900,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $4,100,000,000.
On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $1,400,000,000.
On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $ 800,000,000.
On page 7, line 4, decrease the amount by $ 700,000,000.
On page 7, line 6, decrease the amount by $ 900,000,000.
On page 19, line 24, increase the amount by $5,000,000,000.
On page 19, line 25, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 20, line 4, increase the amount by $2,800,000,000.
On page 20, line 8, increase the amount by $800,000,000.
On page 20, line 12, increase the amount by $300,000,000.
On page 53, line 1, increase the amount by $5,000,000,000.
On page 53, line 2, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, on Monday, we heard Secretary Leavitt tell us that the avian flu will arrive in the United States by this fall. And if our worst fears are realized and it becomes a virus that can spread easily from human to human, the avian flu could be here within 30 days.

As Dr. Julie Greenberg, Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, has said, ''This is the most important threat we face right now.'' We are not talking about hundreds or thousands of lives here—we are talking millions. Millions.

The question, then, is not whether we have taken steps to prepare ourselves for the avian flu. Instead, the question is whether we have taken every imaginable and necessary precaution—whether we have done everything we possibly could do—to combat potentially the greatest global health threat in a century.

I don't believe that we have. But I know that we must. The United States cannot afford to have a Katrina-level of preparedness or a Katrina-like response to an international outbreak of avian flu. With so many warnings and so much knowledge of the threat we face, there is no excuse for failure this time around.

The first thing we need to do is increase our supply of Tamiflu and other medications. Countries such as Japan, France, England, and others have now stockpiled enough Tamiflu to cover a quarter of their populations. The United States has enough to cover just 2 percent.

If the avian flu mutates and is able to spread between humans, we will also need a new vaccine to treat the new virus. But as we saw during last year's flu season, our vaccine industry remains fragile and even the supply and distribution of something simple like a flu shot poses a challenge. This has to change.

Of course, as Secretary Leavitt has pointed out, the time it takes to develop a new vaccine means that we could be without any treatment for up to 6 months after the avian flu first breaks out. And that means that if we have an outbreak, it is imperative that our public health infrastructure be prepared to handle the crisis.

First, we need a clear chain of command. We can't be wondering who is in charge of dealing with an outbreak.

Second, we need an aggressive outreach campaign to warn and educate the American public about what to do in the event of an outbreak.

Third, it is still unclear how much assistance the Federal Government is willing to provide already cash-strapped States to strengthen their fragile health infrastructures. Although States such as Illinois are rapidly increasing their efforts to prepare, many States will need substantial assistance to buy antivirals and other supplies. And our hospitals and health professionals still don't have the capacity to care for large numbers of sick Americans.

The devastation wrought by Katrina last year has shown us that we cannot stop the forces of nature. But as the wealthiest country on Earth, we can prepare, and we can respond in a way that saves as many lives as possible.

We must do that now with the avian flu. The Conrad avian flu amendment will provide the necessary funds for Federal agencies, working with the States, to prepare for potential pandemic. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, Senator BURR will be offering an amendment at the same time as mine. What he is offering is a reserve fund that is deficit neutral but has no money attached to it. But later in the process, if funding were provided, that reserve fund would provide a receptacle. That is an empty vessel. There is nothing there.

It has value. I will support Senator BURR's amendment. It has value because at least there is a receptacle, at least there is a vessel, at least there is a way of taking funds that might be provided for later. But I want colleagues to know there is no new funding provided for in the Burr amendment.

The only amendment being offered here that is going to have additional resources to meet a possible pandemic is this one. So I hope colleagues think very carefully before they cast this vote.

With that, Mr. President, I note that Senator LIEBERMAN is in the Chamber. He is next up to offer an amendment on homeland security. Senator LIEBERMAN, of course, is the ranking member of the authorizing committee. He is, I think all would acknowledge on this floor, a leading voice on the question of homeland security.

Mr. President, I ask the Senator, how much time would he require?

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, in a tradition that is associated with my family, I would ask the Senator from North Dakota, how much time does he have to offer?

Mr. CONRAD. Well, could the Senator do it in 10 minutes?

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I am happy to yield 10 minutes off the resolution to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUNUNU). The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair.

AMENDMENT NO. 3034

Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 3034, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN], for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI, proposes an amendment numbered 3034.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To protect the American people from terrorist attacks by providing $8 billion in additional funds for homeland security government-wide, by restoring cuts to vital first responder programs in the Department of Homeland Security and Justice, by providing an additional $1.2 billion for first responders, $1.7 billion for the Coast Guard and port security, $150 million for chemical security, $1 billion for rail and transit security, $456 million for FEMA, $1 billion for health preparedness programs and $752 million for aviation security)

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $2,151,000,000.
On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $2,700,000,000.
On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $1,729,000,000.
On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $1,039,000,000.
On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $203,000,000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $2,151,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $2,700,000,000.
On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $1,729,000,000.
On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $1,039,000,000.
On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $203,000,000.
On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by $7,977,000,000.
On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $2,151,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $2,700,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $1,729,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $1,039,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $203,000,000.
On page 16, line 21, increase the amount by $1,889,000,000.
On page 16, line 22, increase the amount by $892,000,000.
On page 17, line 1, increase the amount by $412,000,000.
On page 17, line 5, increase the amount by $252,000,000.
On page 17, line 9, increase the amount by $135,000,000.
On page 17, line 13, increase the amount by $72,000,000.
On page 17, line 22, increase the amount by $3,747,000,000.
On page 17, line 23, increase the amount by $793,000,000.
On page 18, line 3, increase the amount by $1,350,000,000.
On page 18, line 7, increase the amount by $959,000,000.
On page 18, line 11, increase the amount by $646,000,000.
On page 19, line 24, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 19, line 25, increase the amount by $125,000,000.
On page 20, line 4, increase the amount by $540,000,000.
On page 20, line 8, increase the amount by $185,000,000.
On page 20, line 12, increase the amount by $100,000,000.
On page 20, line 16, increase the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 24, line 24, increase the amount by $1,341,000,000.
On page 24, line 25, increase the amount by $341,000,000.
On page 25, line 4, increase the amount by $398,000,000.
On page 25, line 8, increase the amount by $333,000,000.
On page 25, line 12, increase the amount by $158,000,000.
On page 25, line 16, increase the amount by $111,000,000.
On page 53, line 1, increase the amount by $7,977,000,000.
On page 53, line 2, increase the amount by $2,151,000,000.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

I thank my friend from North Dakota. I thank him for his leadership on these matters of budget and really for his steadfastness.

Mr. President, I rise today to offer this amendment to the fiscal year 2007 budget resolution to strengthen our homeland security efforts in the face of the administration's budget, which in this regard—considering the fact we are in the post-9/11 world, in a long war against Islamist terrorism—I consider the administration's budget to be shortsighted and short funded, to be ill-considered and inadequate.

In my capacity as the ranking Democrat on the Homeland Security Committee, I have worked very closely with our chair, Senator COLLINS of Maine. This year, for the third year, I have worked with my staff, with experts from outside of the Government, to construct what I believed would be a wartime budget for homeland security. A budget that would do what really needs to be done to secure the American people against an enemy that has shown it will strike us not on the battlefields of conventional war but in our neighborhoods, where we live and where we work here in the United States of America.

The total I would add to the President's budget for homeland security is $8 billion. That, of course, is a significant sum, but in the overall context of the Federal budget submitted, it is less than one-third of 1 percent of the Federal budget—and it would be used to secure our homeland against an enemy of unprecedented inhumanity and against the forces of nature, which struck us badly in Hurricane Katrina, and, unfortunately, will again.

I propose to pay for this additional funding by tightening a number of tax loopholes. Therefore, the amendment would not add to the deficit.

Of the $8 billion in additional spending I am proposing, $6.2 billion would go directly to the Department of Homeland Security. The remainder is divided between the Department of Justice for law enforcement grants and the Department of Health and Human Services for public health preparedness in the face of a potential biological attack or a pandemic.

The money would restore what I consider to be unjustified cuts for first responders who, in the war against terrorism, are also our first preventers—hundreds of thousands of eyes and ears, of equipment, to detect and stop terrorists.

It would restore cuts for emergency managers and public health officials and make needed new investments in first responder programs. It would strengthen rail, transit, port, aviation, and chemical plant security, as well as Coast Guard readiness and bioterrorism preparedness.

Let me just look at a few of the details.

We know our first responders do not have the training, equipment, and frequently even the manpower they need to do their jobs properly whenever danger strikes.

Here, shown on this chart, is first responder funding. It is unbelievable when you see it charted in this way, in the midst of the long war against terrorism, in which our homeland has been struck. And we must assume the enemy will try to strike us again.

First responder funding in fiscal year 2004 was $3.95 billion. On this chart, you see a steady line going down, to the proposal here: $1.97 billion for the firefighters, the police officers, the emergency responders we depend on to protect us.

The President's budget in this regard would cut preparedness funding by 16 percent overall. It would cut $802 million from the first responder programs—a 23-percent cut from last year and a 50-percent reduction, as shown on the graph, from fiscal year 2004.

The administration's budget would entirely eliminate the Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program and the Justice Assistance Grant Program—totally eliminate them—in a time of war against terrorism, and slash by 78 percent the highly successful, much depended upon COPS Program, Community Oriented Policing Services Program, which has put police officers on the beat throughout America and by and large reduced the incidence of crime.

For the second year in a row, the administration is also proposing to eliminate all funding for the Metropolitan Medical Response System, which supports planning and preparedness for potential mass casualties in a catastrophe. The administration is also proposing to eliminate funding for the SAFER Program, which helps recruit, hire, and train local firefighters. The budget given to us cuts grants that State and local emergency planners rely on to help them prepare for catastrophe. The fact is, without more support, our local communities will remain unprepared. That is dangerous in this age.

My amendment would begin to rebuild that support. It would restore $1.6 billion in proposed cuts to first responder programs and add an additional $1.2 billion to help improve State and local capabilities, especially in the area of interoperable communications. That would bring the total funding for first responders to $4.1 billion. Can we afford it? Honestly, we cannot afford not to afford it.

We would also restore funding for the programs I have talked about that will be cut in the Justice Department.

What about port security, because this is a comprehensive homeland security budget proposal? Moving on to port security, perhaps the silver lining of the Dubai Ports World disagreement is greater public recognition of the urgent need for port security. Ninety-five percent of all of the goods coming into America flow through our ports. A terrorism attack at a port would cause economic havoc, let alone human loss. And experts, of course, worry that weapons of mass destruction could be smuggled into this country in a shipping container.

We, therefore, must invest strategically in our defense, which is why this amendment would add an additional $1.7 billion for port security and for the Coast Guard, which performed so admirably in response to Hurricane Katrina but still does not have the capitalized, updated equipment it needs to do the job—enormous job—we are asking it to do.

On chemical security, we know too many facilities remain vulnerable and

that an attack on one near a high-population center could have the same effect as a weapon of mass destruction. The administration's proposal is only $10 million. It is inadequate when compared with the $102 million the Coast Guard spent in 2005 and the $131 million it will spend in 2006 to protect chemical facilities at ports.

We face, as Senator CONRAD has said, the threat and danger of bioterrorism and bioterrorist attacks and pandemics, and yet inadequate funding is provided. Thus, my amendment would increase the money given to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, funding for State and local bioterrorism programs by $500 million and add another $500 million to the Health Resources and Services Administration bioterrorism program.

We have to absorb the painful dual lessons of September 11, 2001, and of August 29, 2005, the day Katrina struck. Our enemies are ruthless and choose to fight us at points of vulnerability. That is why we have to close those vulnerabilities. Nature will strike in unpredictable ways year after year. Yet so much of our national homeland security structure continues to have gaps. There is no cheap way to provide for the common defense, our constitutional responsibility. We have the best military in the world, and we have it because we have invested in it. We have the best personnel to carry out the protection of our homeland. We will never have the homeland defense we need unless we are prepared to spend for it. There is no more urgent need the American people have.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I appreciate the extraordinary commitment of the Senator from Connecticut to national defense, to a responsible policy in fighting terrorism. He is clearly one of the leaders in the Senate and the Nation on the issue of how we should protect ourselves as a nation. I respect him immensely. I admire him. It is good to have his voice on the issues of foreign policy and international terrorism and how we fight it.

On this issue, however, I respectfully disagree relative to the need for these additional dollars at this time. In this budget, we have robustly funded the fight on terrorism. The defense budget will be increased in the core budget by $30 billion. A lot of that goes toward fighting terrorism. We have set aside $90 billion of additional money, the purpose of which is to fight the war on terrorism. That is $40 billion more than the administration asked for. In addition, within those funds we have dedicated an additional $4 billion specifically to the issue of port security and border security. Quite honestly, as chairman of the committee that has jurisdiction over port security and border security, that is probably more money than those agencies can handle in 1 year. We will have to be careful to be sure that that money is spent effectively and not pushed out the door in purchasing blue lights and whistles. We want to make sure it purchases real assets and adds real manpower that will assist us in the war on terrorism. We have made a huge commitment in this budget to the issue of fighting terrorism.

The Senator from Connecticut correctly points out that first responder funds are down in this budget. That is a decision that has been made because of the fact there was so much first responder money that came so quickly, it simply hasn't been spent effectively yet. There was $13 billion that we have put into first responders across the country. That is a huge number, so large, in fact, that $5.5 billion of it, which has already been appropriated, which is sitting there, has not been spent, going back to 2004. There is literally $5.5 billion sitting in the pipeline that first responder groups have not spent, in part because State planning has not caught up to adequately meet the need for using the available funding. As soon as they are, those dollars will go out. As soon as that pipeline of $5.5 billion starts to get drawn down—remember, we are adding another several billion dollars on top of it in this bill—we are going to refill that pipeline to make sure that first responder funding is adequate.

It is not an issue of lack of dollars. It is an issue of lack of programmatic and systematic infrastructure, to a large degree—and planning, to a large degree. You could put another $40 billion or $8 billion or whatever billion on top of this, and you would still get little improvement in the amount of money flowing out to first responders because the necessity of having the money flow in a way that actually produces programmatic results has not been resolved yet.

It should not be our purpose as the Federal Government to be hiring people for local police forces and local first responder teams. What this money is supposed to be used for primarily is to give them the support so they have the necessary interoperability equipment, the necessary tactical equipment, and the necessary training to be effective as first responders. We should not be taking Federal first responder dollars and replacing local dollars that are already being used for the purposes of putting people on the street. States are making progress. As they come at us, we will put more money out there.

In addition, in the appropriating process we have taken the view, which is a little different than the authorizing committee, that risk should be where the money goes first. If a community has a high likelihood of risk from a terrorist attack, that community should be the place where we put the dollars. This has actually worked to the disadvantage of the State of New Hampshire. But my view is strong that these dollars, which are being used to basically upgrade the capacity of first responders to handle a terrorist attack, should go first to those places most likely to be on the front lines. We know where those places are. They know who they are. That is why we have basically funded it in that manner.

That is where we stand today. Very simply stated, there is an extremely robust commitment to fighting the war on terrorism in this bill: a $30 billion increase in defense spending; $90 billion in a separate budgeting process for fighting the war on terror, $40 billion more than the President asked for; $4 billion of new funds directed right at border security and port security; $2.3 billion directed right at avian flu and the purchasing of necessary supplies and antitoxins and hopefully vaccines, to address that issue. In the pipeline already from prior appropriations, there is $5.5 billion of funds out of the $13 billion that has been appropriated which is available for first responders from prior appropriations onto which we will put another chunk of money here.

The issue is not dollars in almost all these accounts. It is not dollars in terms of this budget. In terms of the President's budget, there may be a difference of opinion, but in terms of this budget the issue is not dollars. The issue is getting those dollars out effectively.

I oppose this amendment. I would have opposed it, anyway, because it basically raises taxes and spends money and breaks the caps. I think that is bad fiscal policy. I also oppose it on substance.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island for his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3074

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 3074.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. REED], for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. KOHL, Mr. BAYH, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. JOHNSON, proposes an amendment numbered 3074.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program by $3,318,000,000 for fiscal year 2007, increasing the funds available to carry out that program to the fully authorized level of $5,100,000,000, to be paid for by closing corporate tax loopholes)

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $2,489,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $763,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $66,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $2,489,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $763,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $66,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by $3,318,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $2,489,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $763,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $66,000,000.

On page 21, line 24, increase the amount by $3,318,000,000.

On page 21, line 25, increase the amount by $2,489,000,000.

On page 22, line 4, increase the amount by $763,000,000.

On page 22, line 8, increase the amount by $66,000,000.

On page 53, line 1, increase the amount by $3,318,000,000.

On page 53, line 2, increase the amount by $2,489,000,000.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, my amendment is straightforward. It would increase funding for the LIHEAP program, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, by $3.318 billion. It is paid for fully by the closing of corporate tax loopholes and is cosponsored by Senators KENNEDY, KERRY, CLINTON, LIEBERMAN, ROCKEFELLER, DORGAN, LEVIN, DAYTON, SCHUMER, KOHL, BAYH, JOHNSON, LEAHY, MENENDEZ, and HARKIN.

The President's budget request and the level of funding assumed in this budget resolution for LIHEAP is $1.782 billion. That represents a $379 million cut from the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. Last week we were struggling to pass an additional $1 billion. The question before us is, are we going to accept this inadequate funding knowing full well it is inadequate today. I hope we don't do that. My amendment, the increase of $3.318 billion, would reach the authorized level of $5.1 billion set by the Energy Policy Act of 2005. On five separate occasions during the course of the debate over LIHEAP in the last 6 months, the majority of the Senate has voted for this full funding level. I call upon all of those Members to join me today to ensure we have full funding. We understand this year we are short of money. The President's budget starts us off with even less.

This year we benefited from unusually warm temperatures. I don't think anyone would bet that next winter's heating season will be as mild and as forgiving as this season's. With higher energy prices—and we know they are going up—with probably lower temperatures, we are going to be in a very serious position unless we adopt this amendment.

In the course of the debate about LIHEAP, many of our colleagues from warmer States pointed out that they are not getting as much as they should. If we get to the $5.1 billion level, this will truly be a national program. Warmer weather States will have the money in the hot season where they need air conditioning to help low-income people. I hope we can do so. For example, Alabama will receive $15 million from the block grant formula under the President's budget. It would receive $87.2 million under my amendment, a 479-percent increase, and so on throughout the country.

I hope we can pass this amendment. I hope we can have the foresight to recognize that we can't start off in the hole. We cannot expect warm temperatures this next heating season. We have to do more for the most vulnerable.

I yield whatever remaining time I have back to the Senator from North Dakota.

AMENDMENT NO. 3136

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his amendment. I thank him also for his courtesy and graciousness.

The situation we have is, I have very few minutes left this morning. We don't have another Senator. I have asked other Senators to come to the floor. While we are waiting, I will do my final amendment. I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] proposes an amendment numbered 3136.

Mr. CONRAD. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide a reserve fund for bold energy legislation that is deficit neutral)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC.____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ENERGY LEGISLATION.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that would reduce our nation's dependence on foreign sources of energy, expand production and use of alternative fuels and alternative fuel vehicles, promote renewable energy development, improve electricity transmission, encourage responsible development of domestic oil and natural gas resources, and reward conservation and efficiency, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2011.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, in many ways this may be one of the most important amendments we offer on our side. I say that because if I look across the horizon at the challenges facing America, energy dependence would be right at the top of the list.

In his State of the Union Message, the President said:

[W]e have a serious problem: America is addicted to oil, which is often imported from unstable parts of the world.

I think the President has that exactly right.

We can see in this chart that imports now account for 60 percent of total U.S. consumption; that is, of the oil that we are consuming, 60 percent of it is imported. That creates a vulnerability for America. This dependence on imported energy is dramatically adding to our record trade deficit; $266 billion of the trade deficit over the last year is due to imported petroleum products. We ran a trade deficit during that period of about $700 billion. More than a third of it is due to our reliance on foreign energy.

That represents over a third of the total trade deficit. The President made very strong statements in the State of the Union about the need to reduce our dependence, reduce our vulnerability. But if you look at his budget, you see something quite different: the clean coal power initiative, cut 90 percent; weatherization assistance grants to improve conservation of energy in homes reduced almost a third; electricity delivery and reliability, cut 23 percent; fossil energy R&D, cut 21 percent.

Mr. President, several weeks ago, President Bush had a small group of Senators to the White House to talk about energy. I told him I was going to be introducing legislation that would provide substantial incentives to do what Brazil did. It is very instructive to look back over the last 30 years. Thirty years ago, Brazil was 80 percent dependent on foreign energy. They reduced that to less than 10 percent today. If we look at our story, it is just the flip. Back in the 1970s, we were 35 percent dependent upon foreign energy; today it is 60 percent.

I think the question presents itself: What did Brazil do? Brazil very aggressively promoted biodiesel, ethanol, and flexible fuel vehicles. In fact, the vast majority of their vehicle fleet in Brazil are now flex fuel vehicles. They have very aggressively promoted ethanol and biodiesel. We should do the same. Those are the key components of the energy plan I will be presenting to our colleagues—aggressive promotion of biodiesel and ethanol, alternative fuel vehicles, wind energy, and coal-to-liquid fuel technology and energy efficiency in conservation.

Mr. President, my energy reserve fund creates a deficit-neutral reserve fund for bold and balanced energy legislation that reduces our Nation's dependence upon foreign sources of energy, expands the production and use of alternative fuels and alternative fuel vehicles, promotes renewable energy development, encourages responsible development of oil and natural gas resources right here in America, and rewards conservation and efficiency.

Mr. President, this is a deficit-neutral reserve fund. Only if we find a way to pay for this initiative will it be able to go forward. My own view is that this is such a high priority for our country and raised, I think, to national attention by the President in his State of

the Union, but we don't have a budget to match bold words. We need bold initiatives to match bold words, to really do something to reduce our dependence. It makes us vulnerable. It is weakening our economy.

I said to the President: What a difference it could make. Would it not be wonderful if the President could wake up and instead of turning to the Middle East for oil, he could look to the Midwest of our own country where we could help grow our way out of this crisis by growing the feedstock that could produce biodiesel and ethanol, soybeans, corn, and canola? We are about to build in North Dakota the biggest biodiesel plant in North America. That is going to help us wean ourselves from this ongoing dependence upon foreign energy. I hope very much my colleagues will support this amendment.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Who yields time?

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I will soon offer an amendment to remove the airline passenger tax increase from this budget. It is fundamentally unfair for the President to raise taxes on everyday families as he doles out massive tax cuts to the wealthy.

Hidden among the thousands of pages in this legislation is a proposal to double the minimum amount that airline passengers pay as a security tax. President Bush wants to increase this tax from $2.50 per flight to $5 per flight. That is a 100-percent tax increase.

The impact on a family of four traveling roundtrip on nonstop flights is illustrated by the chart that we have here. An increase in security tax for a family of four traveling roundtrip on nonstop flights, typically, if it is $20 now, is going to be $40 obviously. That is quite a burden.

The traveling public is already too heavily taxed. Air travelers pay an enormous amount of Federal taxes on every airline ticket—nearly 20 percent of the base fare price now. For example, the tax on the average domestic roundtrip flight of $230 is $45. That is a tax rate of almost 20 percent.

Air travelers are taxed every time they turn around. They pay the Federal excise tax—on top of the Federal segment tax, on top of the passenger facility charge, on top of the security tax. Now the President wants to double the security tax.

To make matters worse, this tax increase will hit families the hardest. Sixty-three percent of the domestic air trips in this country in 2004 were taken for personal purposes, including vacations and visits to families and loved ones.

I am one of the strongest advocates for transportation security resources for our country, but we have to provide these necessary resources by spreading the tax burdens across this country fairly and not targeting everyday Americans while special interests raid the Federal Treasury.

I also want to point out to my colleagues that this amendment is offset by closing abusive tax shelters. So when we look at this, if the airlines don't pass along this tax increase to the average family, they themselves will have to experience further losses. There was $10 billion in losses in 2005 by the aviation industry. That is on top of $32 billion from 2001 to 2004. There were 150,000 jobs lost since 9/11. They just cannot handle it.

So I urge my colleagues to support the amendment and say no to the Bush airline passenger tax increases, keeping in mind that those tax increases are put upon the average family to give the wealthiest among us huge tax breaks. It is unfair and it ought not to be permitted. I urge you in this instance to vote no on further tax increases for the average American family.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Jersey for accommodating the schedule of his colleagues by coming this morning and offering his amendment. Next in the queue is Senator BURR with an amendment on avian flu.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will suspend, the Chair advises that the Senator from New Jersey did not send up an amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 3137

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Yes. We neglected to do the most important part of it. I was overcome by the speech, Mr. President.

I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG] proposes an amendment numbered 3137.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To eliminate the President's proposed tax increase on American airline passengers in fiscal year 2007 and to provide adequate funding for commercial aviation security and to offset these costs by closing corporate tax loopholes)

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $1,230,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $1,230,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by $1,230,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $1,230,000;000.

On page 16, line 21, increase the amount by $1,230,000,000.

On page 16, line 22, increase the amount by $1,230,000,000.

On page 53 , line 1, increase the amount by $1,230,000,000.

On page 53 , line 2, increase the amount by $1,230,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set the pending amendment aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3114

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I send an amendment No. 3114 to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BURR] proposes an amendment numbered 3114.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for the establishment of a reserve fund concerning pandemic influenza preparedness planning)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. RESERVE FUND FOR PANDEMIC INFLUENZA PREPAREDNESS PLANNING.

If the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment is offered thereto, or if a conference report is submitted thereon, that—

(1) rebuilds the vaccine industry in the United States which has shrunk from over 25 to less than 5 companies;

(2) improves the United States capacity to produce life-saving pandemic influenza vaccines and antivirals;

(3) ensures adequate funding for advanced development and acquisition of needed medical countermeasures for biodefense and pandemic influenza protection;

(4) enhances the Strategic National Stockpile of pandemic influenza vaccines, antivirals, and other medical products;

(5) strengthens the Federal, State, and local public health infrastructure to effectively respond to a pandemic influenza outbreak;

(6) increases the domestic and international surveillance and outbreak containment capabilities; and

(7) improves public awareness and education of pandemic influenza preparedness planning;

assuming that the Committee is within its allocation as provided under section 302 (a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations and aggregates to the extent that such legislation would not increase the deficit for fiscal years 2007 and for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2011.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I rise on the Senate floor today to not only offer

this amendment and talk about it, but to speak on an amendment of another Member of the Senate, an amendment that also focuses on the avian flu.

Our country faces threats, some of which we know and some of which we don't know today. One real threat is the threat of pandemic bird flu. The President of the United States was ahead of the curve on this with a proposal to the Congress of over $7 billion for advanced development of vaccines, for the preparation the country needs to go through, and for the stockpiles of antivirals and countermeasures.

The fact is that Congress has responded to his request. This year the budget resolution highlights the fact that the President's request of $2.3 billion of taxpayers' money is in this budget resolution.

My colleague from North Dakota, for whom I have a tremendous amount of respect and who has helped, along with Senator GREGG, to move this budget resolution through this body, has asked we increase that amount by $5 billion. If for 1 minute I thought $5 billion would make America safer, I would be on the floor as a cosponsor of that amendment. But the reality is, we are at a point where we are absorbing all the money we can, given where we are in this process.

I just left a hearing with the Secretary of Health and Human Services. My direct question to him was: The President's budget asked for $2.3 billion. Is that sufficient for 2007?

He looked at me and said: Senator, where we are in the development of vaccines, where we are in our need for stockpiles, that amount fulfills everything we can do in preparation.

So I urge my colleagues not to support the amendment for an additional $5 billion of taxpayers' money to potentially go into a black hole. I remind my colleagues that the way this is funded is to raise taxes on the American people. We have used tax loopholes for corporations to fund many items suggested in amendments on this floor. The fact is, once again, the American people realize this is a covert way of raising taxes on them.

My amendment does something very simple. It creates a reserve fund. It has been described as hollow because it has no money. I believe the American people demand that we bring fiscal responsibility to this institution, to the Congress of the United States. I don't want to tie the hands of individuals within the agencies if they see a need for something, but the creation of this reserve fund allows them to do it in a budget-neutral way.

I believe this will be overwhelmingly supported because, in fact, it doesn't spend any new money, but it provides the flexibility and authority to those who are charged with addressing this threat.

The amendment establishes a reserve fund, and that can help to rebuild our domestic vaccine industry, support advanced development and acquisition of needed drugs and vaccines, strengthen the public health infrastructure, and increase surveillance and outbreak containment.

We are at a point in this Congress where we have the opportunity to reauthorize the Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act, and we are considering legislation on advanced development of vaccines and countermeasures against chemical, biological, or radiological and natural threats. There are many issues that we have to decide exactly how we are going to handle. But to throw money at them is, in fact, not the answer today.

Those who are charged with the responsibility of making sure this country is prepared, in fact, have sufficient funding today. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Conrad amendment, to vote for the Burr amendment, and to make sure this administration is able to carry out what has been a well-planned preparation for a known threat to this country and, I might add, to the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask that 10 minutes of the chairman's time be yielded to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the chairman very much. We have been trying to distribute time so we can most efficiently use time on the floor. I yield 3½ minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3081

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from North Dakota. I call up amendment No. 3081 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment is set aside. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. SALAZAR], for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mr. LEAHY, proposes an amendment numbered 3081.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To fully fund the Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) program. Adds $152 million to Function 800 (General Government) for PILT. Paid for by closing $152 million in corporate tax loopholes)

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $152,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $152,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by $152,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $152,000,000.

On page 25, line 24, increase the amount by $152,000,000.

On page 25, line 25, increase the amount by $152,000,000.

On page 53, line 1, increase the amount by $152,000,000.

On page 53, line 2, increase the amount by $152,000,000.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, this amendment aims to fully fund the Payment in Lieu of Taxes Program for our country. It is an issue of vital importance to rural America. I am pleased to be joined in this effort today by Senator BINGAMAN and Senator LEAHY who are cosponsors of this amendment.

As I have said often on this floor before, rural America continues to wither on the vine. I will continue to come to this floor and sound the alarm of the plight of rural America because I am absolutely certain it doesn't have to be this way.

The heartland of this country is a vast reservoir of American potential and strength, and the values, common sense, perseverance, and work ethic embodied in the 50 million people who live in rural America are national treasures in and of themselves.

These people are also the stewards of our many public lands, and they deserve support in that effort. That is where PILT comes in. Created in 1976, PILT compensates local government for the presence of nontaxable Federal lands within their boundaries, as well as the associated costs of providing work, such as road work and law enforcement, to visitors on those lands.

Over the years, inflation has taken its toll. Repeatedly underfunding the PILT Program has also sent precisely the wrong message to rural America. Full PILT funding for fiscal year 2007 will likely be close to $350 million, but the President's budget for PILT was reduced by $38 million, or 16 percent, from where it was last year.

This is not just about my State of Colorado where some counties are owned by the Federal Government to the extent of 95 percent; it is about governments in at least 49 of our States where there are significant public land holdings within those States.

This amendment is fully offset by tax loophole closures. Some colleagues have approached me about alternatives, and I will work with them to explore other ideas in terms of funding alternatives.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this modest, commonsense amendment. When I travel through the rural counties of Colorado, I hear the voices of proud, hard-working rural Americans who feel neglected by Washington. Let's take an opportunity in a very small way in this budget resolution to send a different signal that we in Washington care about rural America.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Colorado. This is an important amendment, certainly an important amendment to Western

States such as ours that all too often are shortchanged in terms of what they get in lieu of taxes where the Federal Government owns vast tracts of land and then is not a good neighbor, doesn't pay its fair share of the tab.

I thank the Senator from Colorado for his excellent amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). Who yields time?

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I ask that Senator BAYH be added as a cosponsor to my avian flu amendment No. 3133.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I see the Senator from Maryland is now on the floor. I say to the Senator from Maryland, I now have 6 minutes left, and I am wondering if I could give 4 minutes to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Yes, that would be fine.

Mr. CONRAD. I have to give some time to Senator BAUCUS before the debt limit vote. So I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the Senator. Does that leave the Senator with enough time for his other purposes?

Mr. CONRAD. I am sure Senator GREGG and I will be able to work it out.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, I thank the Senator very much.

AMENDMENT NO. 3103

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, I offer amendment No. 3103.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES], for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. REED, proposes an amendment numbered 3103.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To restore funding for the civil works programs of the Corps of Engineers, the Federal Water Pollution Control State Revolving Fund, the National Park Service, the Forest Service, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Federal conservation programs, and other natural resource needs, through an offset achieved by closing corporate tax loopholes)

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $1,718,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $699,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $320,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $116,000,000.

On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $58,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, decrease the amount by $1,718,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, decrease the amount by $699,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, decrease the amount by $320,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, decrease the amount by $116,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, decrease the amount by $58,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by $2,912,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $1,718,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $699,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $320,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $116,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $58,000,000.

On page 13, line 21, increase the amount by $2,912,000,000.

On page 13, line 22, increase the amount by $1,718,000,000.

On page 14, line 1, increase the amount by $699,000,000.

On page 14, line 5, increase the amount by $320,000,000.

On page 14, line 9, increase the amount by $116,000,000.

On page 14, line 13, increase the amount by $58,000,000.

On page 53, line 1, increase the amount by $2,912,000,000.

On page 53, line 2, increase the amount by $1,718,000,000.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, this amendment is to restore funding for function 300 Natural Resources and Environment, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that Senator LIEBERMAN and Senator REED of Rhode Island be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SARBANES. If the Chair would tell me when 1 minute is left on my time, I would be most appreciative.

Madam President, the purpose of this amendment is to restore funding for a number of important environmental programs under function 300. The President's budget request and the chairman's mark on the resolution cut funding for water resources, conservation and land management, recreational resources, pollution control and abatement, and other natural resources and environmental activities by nearly $3 billion from the baseline, or almost 10 percent. This amendment would seek to add $2.9 billion to bring the function 300 total back up to baseline. It is offset with revenues from the closing of corporate tax loopholes.

We have a list of possibilities, many of which have passed the Senate before and have been strongly supported by very large majorities in this body. Let me just give a few examples of the kinds of programs we are trying to at least provide some additional support for, although it falls short of what the need is; but we are trying to get back to baseline.

The Army Corps of Engineers civil works program, flood control, navigation, storm protection, environmental restoration—I hardly need, in the aftermath of Katrina, to emphasize the importance of such programs. The EPA budget has been sharply cut, including nearly $200 million from the clean water State revolving loan fund, which is now in this budget at the lowest funding level ever for clean water infrastructure. It has been cut by nearly 50 percent from the 2004 level because there has been a steady decline, and, of course, this impacts every State's and every community's ability to upgrade their waste water infrastructure and meet Clean Water Act requirements.

The National Park Service is being cut. Our National Parks have a desperate need for funding in order to carry out their activities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, the National Park Service is falling well short of what they need in order to sustain the park system. NOAA is being cut in this budget, including the National Marine Fisheries Service. There is a lot of emphasis on our oceans. Two commissions have studied it. Yet the Oceans Commission says we are falling well short of any real commitment there. The NOAA budget is cut, the Fish and Wildlife Service budget, and the Forest Service. This amendment seeks to at least bring back this funding to function 300 for all of these very important environmental and natural resource problems to baseline, to current funding levels.

I very much hope my colleagues will support this amendment and contribute to protecting the environment and health of our Nation's citizens, helping to ensure that we have clean water and that we breathe clean air.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I yield 2½ minutes to Senator DORGAN from North Dakota.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, I support Senator SARBANES' effort to restore funding for our agencies and programs directed at natural resource conservation and management and some of our fundamental environmental responsibilities. The programs and agencies include the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, the National Park Service, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Forest Service, the Army Corps of Engineers, and others. I do believe that we must meet our stewardship responsibilities and the President's budget simply doesn't cut it.

I do, however, want to flag a problem related to the Army Corps of Engineers. It is a problem that cripples the Corps: The minute its budget arrives on our doorsteps, Members of Congress scramble for Corps earmarks. We must move away from this earmarking and focus on national priorities. I will continue working to change the way this agency operates.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I am going to be offering an amendment. I have noticed an amendment dealing with Indian program funding. I think most who understand these issues understand that we have a bona fide crisis in Indian health care, Indian housing, and Indian education. We have had hearings. I have had hearings in my State, and we have had hearings in the Indian Affairs Committee, and we have to address these issues. The issue of Indian health care is not an optional issue. When there is a young child on an Indian reservation or an elder on an Indian reservation who is sick, they need health care.

This is interesting. We have trust responsibility for health care for a couple of groups of Americans. One is Federal prisoners. If they are incarcerated, we have a responsibility to Federal prisoners for their health care. We also have trust responsibility for health care for American Indians. That is our trust responsibility. We spend nearly twice as much—twice as much—per person to provide health care for Federal prisoners as we do for American Indians. That is wrong.

Housing: We have a bona fide crisis in housing. In many cases on many of America's Indian reservations we have people living in Third World conditions.

Education: Do we really want a young child who is 6 or 8 years old to be walking through the doorway of a grade school and receiving an education that is much less of an education than other children are simply because we don't have the money? Shouldn't these young Indian children be given the opportunity for a good education? I think with respect to education, the GAO report shows quite clearly that facilities in BIA schools are inferior to other schools.

My point is this: When we take a look at our priorities, what is important, what we should be doing, we see that we have Americans living in Third World conditions on many of these Indian reservations. We have a crisis in health care, in education and housing, and we ought to do something about it. You can't go to these places and look at their health care system or look at their schools or look at people living in substandard housing and believe that it is not a priority for this Congress to meet its responsibilities.

I have offered this legislation before in the form of an amendment. I do so again today. I have a number of cosponsors I would like to add for the RECORD.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, what is the time situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire controls 7 minutes.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, although I don't agree with him, I yield 3½ minutes to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, might I, with the indulgence of my colleagues, simply read the cosponsors? They are Senators CANTWELL, MURRAY, BINGAMAN, and JOHNSON are added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend. The amendment has not yet been offered.

The Senator from Montana is recognized.

DEBT LIMIT EXTENSION

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I am speaking on an amendment I have offered to the debt limit. This amendment would simply require the Treasury Department to report on the economic and security implications of our debt to foreigners. Massive budget deficits are forcing America to borrow heavily. Last year, foreigners bought 96 percent of the Treasury bills that our Government sold to finance our debt—96 percent. That is an astounding statistic. The debt purchased last year, almost all of it, was purchased by foreigners, 96 percent.

Foreigners are becoming our bankers. America is becoming a debtor to foreign powers.

I think we need to understand this change. This amendment asks the Treasury to investigate what the full cost of our indebtedness will be, in higher interest rates, the value of a dollar, lower economic growth, less power to negotiate trade agreements, and diminished national security. We should let taxpayers know how big the cost of this foreign debt really is. This amendment will help to get the answers.

Some will make breathless arguments that passing this amendment will endanger the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government. I say that is hogwash. If the Senate passes this amendment, the House of Representatives could pass it and have the bill on the President's desk before suppertime, on the President's desk this evening.

The real reason some are opposing this amendment is to save the House of Representatives from having to vote on the debt limit even once—to save the House of Representatives, to save those folks on the other side of the body, on the other side of the Capitol, from having to vote on the debt limit. That is really what is going on here. I think if Senators vote on the debt limit, certainly House Members should vote on the debt limit, too. That is an embarrassingly poor reason to vote against a study that would help protect America's economic and security interests.

Last year, foreigners bought 96 percent of the Treasury bills that our Government sold—actually 96 percent—just to remind everybody. I therefore urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment to help find out what our foreign debt really means for America.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I know the chairman of the Finance Committee is coming over, and he may want to speak to this issue, but the time may lapse before he gets here so let me make this point: The study which the Senator is asking for could occur and would occur—and I can't speak for the chairman of the Finance Committee, but I would certainly be willing to sign the letter, and I suspect the chairman would, too. But simply writing the letter down there from the committees of jurisdiction—I don't happen to be a committee of jurisdiction, although it is an interesting issue—and then the chairman and the ranking member could get the study.

The reason this amendment is being put on this bill is to try to send it back to the House to delay the process so that the debt ceiling ends up with some political votes somewhere along the line. That is just gamesmanship and there is no need for it.

We should have this amendment taken off this bill. If there is a desire for this information, which we could certainly obtain rather easily by sending a letter demanding that they do the study, and then have GAO do the study—a little independence on the study might even be good—do a joint task force and get the information. So the amendment really isn't necessary at all.

So I agree with what I think is the leadership's position on this side, that this amendment is just dilatory and will end up delaying the debt ceiling legislation, which is a mistake. That is why it is opposed.

Has all my time expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I see the Democratic leader, and I will yield back my time and let the Democratic leader take leader time.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I will use leader time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, President Thomas Jefferson said:

> I place economy among the first and most important government virtues, and public debt as the greatest of the dangers to be feared.

That was President Thomas Jefferson.

Today the Senate is considering a bill to increase the Nation's debt by $781 billion. If adopted, it would be the fourth such increase in the 5 years this administration has been in office. I will be opposing this latest request, and I hope that people on both sides of the aisle will do the same.

Any objective analysis of our country's fiscal history would have to conclude this administration and this rubberstamping Republican Congress are the most fiscally irresponsible in the history of our country. In fact, no other President or Congress even comes close. When this administration came to office, the Federal Government was running large annual budget surpluses that were projected to continue as far as the eye could see. These projected surpluses were so large that the Congressional Budget Office estimated the Federal Government would pay off all its publicly held debt by the year 2009. In fact, Alan Greenspan, then the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, and other economists expressed concern that these surpluses would be so huge they risked unsettling the financial markets.

Because of the reckless fiscal policies of this President and the Republican-controlled Congress, 2009 will be a year to recognize President Bush's multi-trillion-dollar red-ink special. Over the past 5 years, rather than running record surpluses and reducing record amounts of debt, our Nation suffered record deficits and debt increases. In fact, when it comes to deficits, this President owns all the records. The three largest deficits in our Nation's history have all occurred under this administration's watch. The deterioration of the Federal Government's finances is the direct result of the misguided priorities of this administration and this rubberstamping Republican Congress.

These deficits have resulted in an unprecedented and dangerous borrowing spree. The total debt during this spree has grown by trillions of dollars. President Abraham Lincoln said:

> As an individual who undertakes to live by borrowing soon finds his original means devoured by interest and next no one left to borrow from, so must it be with government.

O, if the Republican President and Republican-dominated Congress had followed the advice of Abraham Lincoln.

The legislation on the floor today will push the Nation's borrowing limit to nearly $9 trillion. Compounding matters, the President's most recent budget—much of which Senate Republicans have placed before the Senate this week—would make matters substantially worse, leading to $12 trillion debt by 2011, just as the first wave of baby boomers is beginning to retire.

Not only is debt exploding at the worst possible time, increasingly we are borrowing from foreign lenders. Since this administration took office, U.S. debt financed by foreigners has more than doubled, increasing by well over $1 trillion. That is more foreign-held debt in 5 years than the Nation accumulated in the first 224 years of this Republic. By contrast, during the last 3 years of the Clinton administration, we paid off hundreds of billions of dollars of debt, including $200 billion in debt to foreign lenders.

Given the explosion of debt in recent years, it is long past time for Washington to change the course and adopt a new fiscal policy. After all, the future of our economy and our Nation is at stake. The Comptroller General of the United States, David Walker, told the Senate Budget Committee recently:

> Continuing on this unsustainable fiscal path will gradually erode, if not suddenly damage, our economy, our standard of living and ultimately our national security.

If my Republican friends believe that increasing our debt by almost $800 billion today, and more than $3 trillion dollars over the last 5 years, is the right thing to do, they should be upfront about it. They should explain why they believe more debt is good for our economy. How can the Republican majority and this Congress explain to their constituents that trillions of dollars of new debt is good for our economy? How can they explain that they think it is fair to force our children, our grandchildren, and our great grandchildren to finance this debt through higher taxes? That is what will have to happen. Why is it right to increase this Nation's dependence on foreign creditors? They should explain this.

Maybe they can convince the public they are right. I doubt it, because most Americans know that increasing the debt is the last thing we should be doing. After all, I repeat, the baby boomers are about to retire. Under the circumstances, any credible economist would tell you we should be reducing debt, not increasing it.

Again, on debt—Thomas Jefferson. These are his words:

> And to preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty—or profusion and servitude.

That was President Thomas Jefferson.

Democrats will not be making arguments to support this legislation which will weaken our country. The President often speaks of personal responsibility. In a speech before African-American leaders earlier in his administration, the President stated that a President is judged not by the words he speaks but by the work he leaves behind. By that benchmark, the President and this Republican-controlled Congress will not be judged kindly with respect to the stewardship of our Nation's finances.

We are being asked to do what should not be asked of us, to increase the debt to almost $9 trillion. I hope everyone walking down to these desks today will understand what they are doing, what they are doing to our country. On this side of the aisle, we know.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

AMENDMENT NO. 3102

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, let me ask for consideration of amendment 3102, as I had previously filed. That is the legislation I described previously. Senators CANTWELL, MURRAY, BINGAMAN, and JOHNSON join me in proposing this amendment as cosponsors. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. BINGAMAN, proposes an amendment numbered 3102.

Mr. DORGAN. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

> (Purpose: To increase funding by $1 billion for various tribal programs and provide necessary additional funding based on recommendations from Indian country, by closing corporate loopholes.)

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $285,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $197,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $230,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $263,000,000.

On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $302,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $285,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $197,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $230,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $263,000,000.

On page 4: line 6, increase the amount by $302,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $299,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $385,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $154,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $126,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $15,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, decrease the amount by $14,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, decrease the amount by $188,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $76,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $137,000,000.

On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $287,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, increase the amount by $14,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, increase the amount by $202,000,000.

On page 6, line 12, increase the amount by $126,000,000.

On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $11,000,000.

On page 6, line 16, decrease the amount by $298,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by $14,000,000.
On page 6, line 24, increase the amount by $202,000,000.
On page 7, line 2, increase the amount by $126,000,000.
On page 7, line 4, decrease the amount by $11,000,000.
On page 7, line 6, decrease the amount by $298,000,000.
On page 13, line 21, increase the amount by $25,000,000.
On page 13, line 22, increase the amount by $13,000,000.
On page 14, line 1, increase the amount by $8,000,000.
On page 14, line 5, increase the amount by $4,000,000.
On page 14, line 9, increase the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 17, line 22, increase the amount by $120,000,000.
On page 17, line 23, increase the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 18, line 3, increase the amount by $33,000,000.
On page 18, line 7, increase the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 18, line 11, increase the amount by $18,000,000.
On page 18, line 15, increase the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 18, line 24, increase the amount by $120,000,000.
On page 18, line 25, increase the amount by $17,000,000.
On page 19, line 4, increase the amount by $90,000,000.
On page 19, line 8, increase the amount by $8,000,000.
On page 19, line 12, increase the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 19, line 24, increase the amount by $540,000,000.
On page 19, line 25, increase the amount by $187,000,000.
On page 20, line 4, increase the amount by $203,000,000.
On page 20, line 8, increase the amount by $75,000,000.
On page 20, line 12, increase the amount by $75,000,000.
On page 21, line 24, increase the amount by $125,000,000.
On page 21, line 25, increase the amount by $46,000,000.
On page 22, line 4, increase the amount by $25,000,000.
On page 22, line 8, increase the amount by $18,000,000.
On page 22, line 12, increase the amount by $15,000,000.
On page 22, line 16, increase the amount by $13,000,000.
On page 24, line 24, increase the amount by $70,000,000.
On page 24, line 25, increase the amount by $7,000,000.
On page 25, line 4, increase the amount by $26,000,000.
On page 25, line 8, increase the amount by $22,000,000.
On page 25, line 12, increase the amount by $15,000,000.
On page 53, line 1, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 53, line 2, increase the amount by $298,000,000.

INCREASING THE STATUTORY LIMIT ON THE PUBLIC DEBT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 10:30 having arrived, the Senate will resume consideration of H.J. Res. 47, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 47), increasing the statutory limit on the public debt.

Pending:

Baucus/Lincoln amendment No. 3131, to require a study of debt held by foreigners.

AMENDMENT NO. 3131

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 3131.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) would vote ''yea.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENSIGN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 55, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 53 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Akaka	Feinstein	Mikulski
Baucus	Harkin	Murray
Bayh	Inouye	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Jeffords	Nelson (NE)
Boxer	Johnson	Obama
Byrd	Kennedy	Pryor
Cantwell	Kerry	Reed
Carper	Kohl	Reid
Clinton	Landrieu	Rockefeller
Conrad	Lautenberg	Salazar
Dayton	Leahy	Sarbanes
Dodd	Levin	Schumer
Dorgan	Lieberman	Stabenow
Durbin	Lincoln	Wyden
Feingold	Menendez	

NAYS—55

Alexander	DeWine	McConnell
Allard	Dole	Murkowski
Allen	Domenici	Roberts
Bennett	Ensign	Santorum
Bond	Enzi	Sessions
Brownback	Frist	Shelby
Bunning	Graham	Smith
Burns	Grassley	Snowe
Burr	Gregg	Specter
Chafee	Hagel	Stevens
Chambliss	Hatch	Sununu
Coburn	Hutchison	Talent
Cochran	Inhofe	Thomas
Coleman	Isakson	Thune
Collins	Kyl	Vitter
Cornyn	Lott	Voinovich
Craig	Lugar	Warner
Crapo	Martinez	
DeMint	McCain	

NOT VOTING—1

Biden

The amendment (No. 3131) was rejected.

Mr. GREGG. I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the next vote in this series be 10 minutes in length; further, that when the votes begin at 1:30, all votes after the first vote be limited to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Democratic leader.

SENATOR SARBANES 11,000TH VOTE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we just completed a vote that is a landmark for one of our Senators. Senator PAUL SARBANES cast his 11,000th vote.

It was only a few days ago that we stopped the proceedings of the Senate to underline and underscore the voting record of the senior Senator from Vermont, Senator LEAHY.

Senator SARBANES has decided not to run for reelection, as we all know, but what a legacy he has in the Senate. There is no one with a better academic record than PAUL SARBANES: Princeton University, summa cum laude, Phi Beta Kappa; a Rhodes scholar; he studied, of course, because of that, at Oxford; Harvard Law School.

Those who have had the privilege of working with PAUL SARBANES know that not only does he have this great intellect, he has so much common sense. Legislation he works on is detailed, very thorough.

He, of course, is our ranking member of the Committee on Banking. I have traveled with the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland. We have traveled various parts of the world. I have fond memories of PAUL SARBANES and all the things he has done. His wife Chris is a wonderful, caring person, just like PAUL.

Even though I have a lot of stories, I share one with the Senate. One of the things people do not realize about Senator SARBANES is his athletic ability. He is a great athlete. I was told a story about Senator SARBANES that for me is a classic. I love baseball. I follow the history of baseball. In high school, he was a star baseball player. He was selected to play on an all-star team. He was a shortstop. He comes to the all-star team as the shortstop from the Eastern Shore. The manager coach announces the starting lineup and he has SARBANES at second base. PAUL went up to the coach and said, I am a shortstop. I was selected as an all-star shortstop. The coach ignored him. He went back again, and finally the coach said, Kaline is starting shortstop. Al Kaline was a better shortstop, at least the coach thought so, than PAUL SARBANES. Al Kaline went to the Major Leagues when he was 18 or 19 years old and is in the Baseball Hall of Fame.

I know we have a lot of things to do today. People are going to the White House. There are a lot of places to go and this is a very important bill, but I could not let the time go by without acknowledging one of the great Senators in the history of our country, Senator PAUL SARBANES of Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask to speak not to exceed 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, one of the greatest orations ever uttered was the

oration on the Crown. And it can be said that the theme of that oration was a question: Who least serves the State? Demosthenes answered that question: He who does not say what he thinks.

Socrates was asked which great oration of Demosthenes he liked best. Socrates answered, ''The longest.'' In other words, he liked the longest oration Demosthenes ever uttered. The Greeks taught the world to think.

This man who is going to leave us after this term, regrettably, and to our great loss, has always impressed me as a thinker, one in the train of Demosthenes.

PAUL SARBANES is a great Senator, a great Senator.

I can remember when he went with me and other Senators to Panama. There we talked to Torrijos and the other leaders of Panama, including our own people. It was there that I changed my mind about the Panama Canal Treaty. PAUL SARBANES was one of those who was there, who walked with us, who talked with us, who was on plane with Torrijos.

PAUL SARBANES has not only been a thinker, he has been a great inspiration to those who have served with him. He will be missed. He will not be replaced. There are no more PAUL SARBANES. I shall never forget him. He leaves a great void when he goes.

One might say: Whence cometh another?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, much is being said about my dear and esteemed colleague, Senator SARBANES. He has been the longest serving Senator in Maryland's history. And I would put to the Senate, he has been the best serving Member of the U.S. Senate from Maryland.

Sure, he cast 11,000 votes, but each and every one of our colleagues will know that when those 11,000 votes were cast, they were cast with thoughtfulness, with due diligence, with the idea of how would that vote serve the Nation and how would it help Maryland.

If we want to honor Senator PAUL SARBANES, let's make sure every vote we cast brings to it the same kind of integrity, the same kind of intelligence, and the same kind of devotion and dedication. That is what I would like to do as the junior Senator, and say thank you for being side by side with me.

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I know we want to proceed with our business, but if I could just be recognized for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for their very gracious remarks and all of my colleagues for their expressions of respect and affection.

My colleague, Senator MIKULSKI, said I was the longest serving Senator in Maryland's history. I want you to know, it is a little bit like being like Cal Ripken; every day you go to work, you set a new record—one more day than the day before.

It has been, obviously, one of the great focuses and joys of my life to be able to work here in the Senate with all my colleagues. I am extremely grateful to all of you.

I will just close with this story, because I am still here until the 3rd of January 2007. So there is still time to go.

But I once got an award. My mother was there at this dinner. This was a few years ago. And they asked her to speak as well. So she got up to speak, and she said how honored she was they had given this recognition to her son, and so forth, and how much she appreciated it. And then she closed her remarks by saying: He has been a good boy—so far.

I carry that comment with me.

Thank you all very much.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if I could just briefly say to our good friend from Maryland that Republican Senators, too, join in wishing him well on this extraordinary accomplishment. And if he would like to resign any time before January, that would be all right, too. But in the meantime, we are glad to have you around.

Congratulations, Senator SARBANES.

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about America's debt problem.

The fact that we are here today to debate raising America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure. It is a sign that the U.S. Government can't pay its own bills. It is a sign that we now depend on ongoing financial assistance from foreign countries to finance our Government's reckless fiscal policies.

Over the past 5 years, our federal debt has increased by $3.5 trillion to $8.6 trillion. That is ''trillion'' with a ''T.'' That is money that we have borrowed from the Social Security trust fund, borrowed from China and Japan, borrowed from American taxpayers. And over the next 5 years, between now and 2011, the President's budget will increase the debt by almost another $3.5 trillion.

Numbers that large are sometimes hard to understand. Some people may wonder why they matter. Here is why: This year, the Federal Government will spend $220 billion on interest. That is more money to pay interest on our national debt than we'll spend on Medicaid and the State Children's Health Insurance Program. That is more money to pay interest on our debt this year than we will spend on education, homeland security, transportation, and veterans benefits combined. It is more money in one year than we are likely to spend to rebuild the devastated gulf coast in a way that honors the best of America.

And the cost of our debt is one of the fastest growing expenses in the Federal budget. This rising debt is a hidden domestic enemy, robbing our cities and States of critical investments in infrastructure like bridges, ports, and levees; robbing our families and our children of critical investments in education and health care reform; robbing our seniors of the retirement and health security they have counted on.

Every dollar we pay in interest is a dollar that is not going to investment in America's priorities. Instead, interest payments are a significant tax on all Americans—a debt tax that Washington doesn't want to talk about. If Washington were serious about honest tax relief in this country, we would see an effort to reduce our national debt by returning to responsible fiscal policies.

But we are not doing that. Despite repeated efforts by Senators CONRAD and FEINGOLD, the Senate continues to reject a return to the commonsense Pay-go rules that used to apply. Previously, Pay-go rules applied both to increases in mandatory spending and to tax cuts. The Senate had to abide by the commonsense budgeting principle of balancing expenses and revenues. Unfortunately, the principle was abandoned, and now the demands of budget discipline apply only to spending.

As a result, tax breaks have not been paid for by reductions in Federal spending, and thus the only way to pay for them has been to increase our deficit to historically high levels and borrow more and more money. Now we have to pay for those tax breaks plus the cost of borrowing for them. Instead of reducing the deficit, as some people claimed, the fiscal policies of this administration and its allies in Congress will add more than $600 million in debt for each of the next 5 years. That is why I will once again cosponsor the Pay-go amendment and continue to hope that my colleagues will return to a smart rule that has worked in the past and can work again.

Our debt also matters internationally. My friend, the ranking member of the Senate Budget Committee, likes to remind us that it took 42 Presidents 224 years to run up only $1 trillion of foreign-held debt. This administration did more than that in just 5 years. Now, there is nothing wrong with borrowing from foreign countries. But we must remember that the more we depend on foreign nations to lend us money, the more our economic security is tied to the whims of foreign leaders whose interests might not be aligned with ours.

Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. Leadership means that ''the buck stops here.'' Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices today onto the backs of our children and grandchildren. America has a debt problem

and a failure of leadership. Americans deserve better.

I therefore intend to oppose the effort to increase America's debt limit.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of final passage.

Raising the debt limit is necessary to preserve the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government.

We cannot as a Congress pass spending bills and tax bills and then refuse to pay our bills.

Refusing to raise the debt limit is like refusing to pay your credit card bill—after you've used your credit card.

The time to control the deficits and debt is when we are voting on the spending bills and the tax bills that create it.

Raising the debt limit is about meeting the obligations we have already incurred.

We must meet our obligations. Vote for this bill.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, the spending process in the Congress is broken. Some will argue that now is not the time to debate spending reform or budget reform. They will say that now is not the time to have a debate about our country's spending priorities. They will argue that right now we need to just ''pay our bills'' for past transactions and discuss reforms some time in the future. Raising the debt limit, however, does not count as ''paying the bills.'' We are not paying our bills.

Last fiscal year, the real Federal deficit—the amount by which the Federal debt increased—was $538 billion. When we raise the debt limit, we are not ''paying our bills.'' We are merely taking out another line of credit—another loan—to allow for more spending that we can't afford. It is akin to a deeply indebted family getting a loan for a new car or getting a new credit card or line of credit without cutting up the old credit cards that got them in trouble in the first place.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, the Federal Government spent roughly $2.5 trillion during the last fiscal year. Let's look at that amount of spending another way. If the Federal Government spent $2.5 trillion last year, that means that on average, $6.8 billion was spent each day, or $78,418 was spent per second by the Federal Government.

I believe that it is absolutely necessary to have an open and honest debate about our spending priorities. We are getting ready to increase this country's debt limit to almost $9 trillion. Over the past 5 years, our national debt has increased by $3 trillion, or nearly $9,000 per American. That is a lot of money. In 1990, our total national debt was about $3 trillion. That means that it took our country more than 200 years to accumulate that amount of debt—200 years to increase our debt by $3 trillion. We just added that much new debt in only 5 years.

In 2001, the share of Federal debt per person in this country was a little over $20,000. That includes everyone—not just those in the workforce. According to the Office of Management and Budget and the Census Bureau, total Federal debt per American will rise to $29,000 per American by the end of 2006. That is an increase of $9,000 per man, woman, and child in this country since 2001. But a lot of people are quick to dismiss that figure. They will say that it doesn't matter, that we only need to worry about how debt and deficits compare to economic growth or to the size of the economy. I think a better rule of thumb is how Government growth compares to the growth of wages and earnings.

If regular Americans are tightening their belts, the Federal Government should do the same instead of engaging in yet another spending binge. Since 2001, total Federal debt per American has increased by $9,000. But over that same time period, the average wages of American workers have only increased by $4,200. Over the past 5 years, the growth of Federal debt per person has doubled the growth of average wages of American workers. What makes this situation even worse is that that $9,000 increase in debt per person is just going to get bigger and bigger because we are not doing anything to cut spending or prepare for the impending fiscal crisis that will result from the retirement of the baby boomer generation. Interest on that debt is just going to get larger.

Last year, interest costs—the costs of Federal debt that the Government must pay to those who buy U.S. Treasury bonds—were about 8 percent of the total Federal budget. In contrast, the average American spends roughly 5 percent of his or her income on credit card debt and car loans according to the Federal Reserve. The Federal Government spent close to $200 billion on interest costs alone last year. According to the Government Accountability Office, or GAO, interest costs will consume 25 percent of the entire Federal budget by 2035. Let's put that figure into perspective. Twenty-five percent of the Federal budget is a huge amount.

By way of comparison, the Department of Education's share of Federal spending in 2005 was approximately 3 percent of all Federal spending. The Department of Health and Human Services was responsible for approximately 23 percent of all Federal spending. Spending by the Social Security Administration was responsible for about 20 percent of all Federal spending. Spending on Medicare was about 12 percent of all Federal spending. Spending in 2005 by the Department of Defense—in the midst of two wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and a global war against terrorism—comprised about 19 percent of all Federal spending. Thus, if we do not change our current spending habits, GAO estimates that as a percentage of Federal spending, interest costs in 2035 will be larger than defense costs today, Social Security costs today, Medicare costs today, and education costs today.

No family in America would ever be able to manage its finances this way. No family would be able to build up insane amounts of debt, unilaterally increase all of its credit card limits with no ability to ever pay them off, and still be able to spend, spend, spend without any accountability. We have some very serious problems to address regarding spending priorities in this country.

According to the Congressional Research Service, Congress appropriated $64 billion in earmarks for 2006, the current fiscal year. That doesn't even include the earmarks from the highway bill that was passed in 2005. We are going to spend $64 billion on earmarks and pork projects across the country this year even though it is estimated that the real Federal deficit—including the money that is regularly stolen from Social Security—will again surpass half a trillion dollars.

Earmarks are a serious problem because they put parochial interests ahead of national priorities. They put the interests of the next election ahead of the interests of the next generation. Some, however, argue that earmarks are not really a problem because they comprise a small percent of the budget. They argue that entitlement spending is the problem and that we ought to address that problem instead of focusing on earmarks. These arguments completely miss the point.

If entitlements are the real problem and earmarks are not a problem, then why did entitlement savings passed in the last budget resolution for fiscal year 2006 only amount to $5 billion? If entitlements are the real problem, why did we spend 13 times more money on earmarks last year than we saved in entitlement programs? At that rate, we will solve our country's fiscal problems some time after never. The budget resolution we passed last year created entitlement savings of about $40 billion over the next 5 years. We spent more on earmarks in 1 single year than we saved from entitlement programs over 5 years. Over the past 3 years—since 2004—we have spent nearly $160 billion on earmarks and special interest pork projects according to the Congressional Research Service.

Since 1994, the number of individual earmarks has more than tripled, increasing from 4,126 in 1994 to 12,852 in fiscal year 2006. Of those 12,852 earmarks, over 95 percent were not even included in bill language. Instead, they were hidden within conference reports. Many never even saw the light of day until they were snuck into unamendable conference reports that were sure to be rammed through at the last minute. Earmarking is a very serious problem that needs to be addressed before we can get our fiscal house in order. However, there are also other spending issues that this body should address.

The issue of improper payments by the Federal Government is one that

can and should be fixed. The subcommittee that I chair—the Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management—has examined this issue in depth. We have uncovered numerous examples of improper payments that waste taxpayer money and harm those who aren't receiving the assistance they need. An improper payment is basically a payment that was either made to the right person in the wrong amount or a payment that was given to the wrong person, regardless of the amount. Improper payments include payments that were too high and payments that were too low.

According to estimates by the Office of Management and Budget, improper payments last year totaled $37 billion. That figure is larger than last year's expenditures by the Departments of Commerce, Interior, State, and Environmental Protection Agency combined. The amount of improper payments just from last year could have completely funded four major Federal agencies. Improper payments are a very serious problem. For example, 28 percent of all payments within the earned income tax credit program are incorrectly made. Thus, for every dollar we spend in that program, 25 cents are completely wasted. Improper payments within the Social Security Administration totaled nearly $6 billion. And these figures don't even take into account the seven major programs with outlays totaling about $228 billion that are not yet even reporting their improper payments.

There are some who wish to make the issue of spending a partisan issue, but it is not a partisan issue. Members of both parties are guilty of putting short-term interests ahead of long-term priorities. Last week, Members of both parties voted to ignore Senate budget rules in order to spend an additional $1 billion that is not paid for on home-heating costs even though the month of January was the warmest on record and winter will be over in less than a week. Both parties appear to lack the political courage to make the hard choices to address our impending fiscal crisis. This issue has nothing to do with Republicans and nothing to do with Democrats—it has to do with what is best for the American public.

Mr. President, the spending process in this body is broken. Our priorities are completely out of whack. Earmarking and wasteful spending are out of control. It makes no sense to effectively max out our credit cards and ask for a higher credit limit when we have no intention and no ability to ever actually pay for our debts.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the outcome of today's vote on raising the debt ceiling to nearly $9 trillion is not in question, but our future economic security will be if we do not change from our current disastrous course. We will raise the debt limit today so that the United States does not default on its obligations, but we cannot for a second think that we have solved the problem or even moved in the right direction.

This will be the fourth time in 5 years that we have had to raise the amount the Government is allowed to borrow. This is a direct result of the fiscal irresponsibility of this administration. These policies have taken the Nation from 2 years of record surpluses just 6 years ago—when we were paying down our debt—to record deficits and debt. We are passing on a crippling burden to our children and grandchildren and threatening our economic security.

Since 2002, we have increased the debt limit by an astounding $3 trillion. And unless we make a significant change in our fiscal policies, there are additional increases in our future. The Congressional Budget Office forecasts that our gross Federal debt, which includes debt the Government owes to the public plus funds owed to Federal trust funds, including Social Security and Medicare, will climb from its current level of $8.3 trillion to $12.8 trillion by 2016. Even this extraordinary estimate does not include either the coming costs of military operations in Iraq or the substantial cost of fixing the alternative minimum tax, which if left unchanged will impose unintended tax increases on middle-income taxpayers, which most agree need to be changed.

The burden this massive debt puts on our children is staggering. Today, each American citizen's share of the debt is over $27,000, and it will rise to over $39,000 by 2016. Paying off this debt will require either extraordinary tax increases or significant cuts in critical areas such as defense or Social Security. Tragically, it will mean that an increasing number of taxpayer dollars will be spent not on moving America forward but simply on treading water by making interest payments to our creditors. Even under the CBO's conservative estimates, interest payments on the gross debt will rise from $352 billion in 2005 to $662 billion in 2016. That means over the next 10 years, we will spend an estimated $5.6 trillion on interest payments alone. Making these interest payments means fewer resources are available for our national priorities such as shoring up the Social Security and Medicare trust funds as the babyboom generation begins to retire.

Equally disturbing is what this rampant borrowing will mean for our economic security. As we go deeper into debt to foreign countries we are losing control of our own destiny. Over 90 percent of our newly issued debt is being purchased by foreigners. By the end of 2004, U.S. Treasury debt held by foreigners was close to $2.2 trillion, more than double the amount that was held at the beginning of this administration. This large amount of foreign debt leaves us vulnerable to the priorities of foreign creditors. If foreign investors, including countries, were to decide, for economic or political reasons, to stop financing our debt, the U.S. economy would be in for a severe shock.

Even without a catastrophic event, our unbridled foreign borrowing erodes our power by providing other countries with leverage during trade or other negotiations. We cannot delude ourselves into thinking we can maintain our position in the world if we can't even balance our checkbook.

We need to turn away from this administration's irresponsible fiscal policies. One of the best steps we could take would be to reinstate pay-as-you-go budget enforcement rules that require tax cuts and not just spending to be paid for. This approach worked during the 1990s to help bring about the first surpluses in a generation, and it can work again.

We should also revisit this administration's irresponsible and unfair tax cuts that have driven us so deeply into this deficit ditch. It is unconscionable that middle-class Americans will be paying for years for tax cuts that went primarily to the wealthiest among us. In fact, the top 5 percent of households in our country, whose average income is more than $250,000 a year, received almost half of the President's tax cuts.

Today's action to raise the debt limit will hopefully be a reality check on what Republican fiscal policies have wrought. We need to change course. We need to return to fiscal responsibility. And we need to start climbing out of this deficit ditch before we are buried in it.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent this morning when we considered Senator BAUCUS's amendment to the debt limit increase. If I had been here, I would have supported the Baucus amendment.

The Baucus amendment is clearly needed. The massive scale of other nations' accumulation of our debt has added another level of danger and complexity to our international economic relations.

This is a two-way street. The tsunami of debt created by the policies of this administration has to go somewhere. China is one of the major purchasers of that debt. Japan, Great Britain, and others have major holdings, too. In the short term, that has soaked up a lot of our bonds, and helped to keep interest rates down. That is a good thing.

However, that has kept the Chinese currency artificially low, and ours artificially high. So they can sell their products at a discount, and our exports are more expensive. That is a bad thing.

Our trade deficit was a record $726 billion last year; $202 billion of that was our trade deficit with China alone.

But as the rest of the world copes with the waves of U.S. debt, we are now all in the same leaky boat. There is just so much of our debt other nations want to hold. The more of it they accumulate, the closer we are to the day when they will not want any more.

When that happens, slowly or rapidly, our interest rates will go up, the value of their U.S. bonds will drop, and

we will all have big problems. We need both more awareness, and more understanding, of this fundamental threat to our economic well being and the global economy.

But the roots of that threat lie in the disastrous policies of this administration.

Because this massive accumulation of debt was predicted, because it was foreseeable, because it was unnecessary, because it was the result of willful and reckless disregard for the warnings that were given and for the fundamentals of economic management, I am voting against the debt limit increase.

In the 5 years he has been in office, President Bush has added more to our foreign debt that the 42 Presidents before him. It took 224 years to accumulate $1 trillion of debt to other nations. It took President Bush just 5 years to more than double it.

Over $3 trillion in debt, foreign debt and debt held by Americans, has been piled up by this administration.

When he set out on the course that brought us to this sorry state, the President was clearly and repeatedly warned that massive tax cuts would leave us vulnerable to natural disasters, economic slowdown, or threats to our national security. ''Don't worry,'' the President told us. ''I know what I am doing.''

After 9/11, in the face of what he has himself called the moral equivalent of the World War II, or the Cold War, he insisted that while everything else had changed, he would not change his economic policies.

Facts had changed. His promise to balance the budget, his promise to pay down the debt, were proved to be false.

But he refused to take responsibility for his policies. He refused to admit that a changed world demanded a change of course. His refusal has pushed us deeper and deeper into the hole.

His refusal added $450 billion to the debt in 2002; it added $984 billion in 2003; it added $800 billion in 2004. And here we are again today, adding another $781 billion. With that addition, our national debt will be $8.6 trillion at the end of this year.

The President's budget plans will bring that number to $11.8 trillion at the end of the next 5 years.

This is a record of utter disregard for our Nation's financial future. It is a record of indifference to the price our children and grandchildren will pay to redeem our debt when it comes due.

History will not judge this record kindly.

My vote against the debt limit increase cannot change the fact that we have incurred this debt already, and will no doubt incur more. It is a statement that I refuse to be associated with the policies that brought us to this point.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the Bush administration seeks for the fourth time in 5 years to increase the indebtedness of the United States—this time by $781 billion. This body's consideration of that increase allows us a moment to take stock of the abysmal fiscal health of our country.

As a Washington Post editorial pointed out yesterday morning, this President solemnly pledged upon taking office to payoff $2 trillion in debt held by the public over the next decade. It is patently obvious that President Bush has not just failed but failed spectacularly to deliver on his pledge. He has managed to amass more debt than any President in history, with no end in sight.

By the end of this year, our gross Federal debt is expected to surpass $8.6 trillion, or nearly $28,000 for every man, woman, and child in America. This amount represents an increase of approximately $3 trillion since President Bush took office.

This dramatic runup in the debt has real costs for America's families—both today and for future generations. It puts upward pressure on interest rates for things like student loans, home mortgages, and automobile loans. It raises the cost of capital for business investment. Each of these, in everything but name, represents a tax increase on American families and businesses.

More directly, instead of investing in America's most important priorities—like education, health care, and homeland security—the taxpayers of today and tomorrow must spend more money paying off yesterday's debts. In the late 1990s, interest on the debt represented a declining share of our total budget. Today, that share has begun to rise once again, a trend that would continue under the budget put forward by the administration and the leadership in this body. For 2007 alone, taxpayers will spend $247 billion dollars on interest on the debt instead of American troops and veterans or American families and children.

Our leaders have to be candid with the American public about the sources of this unprecedented level of indebtedness.

The administration is not incurring these debts in order to invest in education. They are not supporting States and local communities struggling to meet their school funding needs out of property taxes.

The administration is not incurring these debts to improve our infrastructure. States, municipalities, and local communities are struggling desperately just to maintain the infrastructure they have—roads, bridges, ports. They are struggling to maintain a 20th century infrastructure, let alone build a 21st century one.

Certainly, the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have had a cost. So have the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, and natural disasters. Though the President has been quick to blame factors like these, the truth is the tax policies of his administration have played a far greater role in creating the budget deficits accumulated on his watch.

Under those policies, this administration has spent close to $125 billion on tax benefits for the few most fortunate households in America—those 0.2 percent of individuals making more than $1 million per year—while doing little, if anything, for families in the middle and those working hard to get themselves in the middle.

In a time of war and fiscal and economic strain, this administration has delivered a tax windfall to the most fortunate. Never before has a President made this choice during a time of war.

Regrettably, this kind of shortsighted leadership has been rubberstamped repeatedly by the leaders of this Congress on the other side of the aisle.

I would have hoped, at a minimum, that we as a body could adopt measures to restore some semblance of fiscal sanity, such as pay-as-you-go budget procedures or a smaller debt limit increase. Unfortunately, neither of these common sense reforms was adopted. Indeed, the majority even rejected an amendment by the Senator from Montana to merely study the impact that foreign-held U.S. debt is having on our Nation's long-term well-being.

We cannot erase what has happened in the past, but we can demonstrate to the people of our country going forward that the Senate is willing to take commonsense steps to put our Nation back on firmer budgetary footing. That, regrettably, has not happened in the Senate today. However, many of us will continue the effort to place our nation's fiscal house on firmer ground.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, is there time to speak on the debt limit?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is not.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 54 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Coleman	Graham
Allard	Collins	Grassley
Allen	Cornyn	Gregg
Bennett	Craig	Hagel
Bond	Crapo	Hatch
Brownback	DeMint	Hutchison
Bunning	DeWine	Inhofe
Burr	Dole	Isakson
Chafee	Domenici	Kyl
Chambliss	Enzi	Lott
Cochran	Frist	Lugar

Martinez
McCain
McConnell
Murkowski
Roberts
Santorum
Sessions
Shelby
Smith
Snowe
Specter
Stevens
Sununu
Talent
Thomas
Thune
Vitter
Voinovich
Warner

NAYS—48

Akaka
Baucus
Bayh
Biden
Bingaman
Boxer
Burns
Byrd
Cantwell
Carper
Clinton
Coburn
Conrad
Dayton
Dodd
Dorgan
Durbin
Ensign
Feingold
Feinstein
Harkin
Inouye
Jeffords
Johnson
Kennedy
Kerry
Kohl
Landrieu
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Lieberman
Lincoln
Menendez
Mikulski
Murray
Nelson (FL)
Nelson (NE)
Obama
Pryor
Reed
Reid
Rockefeller
Salazar
Sarbanes
Schumer
Stabenow
Wyden

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 47) was passed.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. SANTORUM. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 3133

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 83.

Under the previous order, the vote now occurs on the Conrad amendment No. 3133.

Mr. SANTORUM. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 3133.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senator was necessarily absent: the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 55, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 55 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Akaka
Baucus
Bayh
Biden
Bingaman
Boxer
Byrd
Cantwell
Carper
Clinton
Conrad
Dayton
Dodd
Dorgan
Durbin
Feingold
Feinstein
Harkin
Inouye
Jeffords
Johnson
Kennedy
Kerry
Kohl
Landrieu
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Lieberman
Lincoln
Menendez
Mikulski
Murray
Nelson (FL)
Obama
Pryor
Reed
Reid
Rockefeller
Salazar
Sarbanes
Schumer
Stabenow
Wyden

NAYS—55

Alexander
Allard
Allen
Bennett
Bond
Brownback
Bunning
Burns
Burr
Chafee
Chambliss
Coburn
Cochran
Coleman
Collins
Cornyn
Craig
Crapo
DeMint
DeWine
Dole
Domenici
Ensign
Enzi
Frist
Graham
Grassley
Gregg
Hagel
Hatch
Hutchison
Inhofe
Isakson
Kyl
Lott
Lugar
Martinez
McCain
McConnell
Murkowski
Nelson (NE)
Roberts
Santorum
Sessions
Shelby
Smith
Snowe
Specter
Stevens
Sununu
Talent
Thomas
Thune
Vitter
Warner

NOT VOTING—1

Voinovich

The amendment (No. 3133) was rejected.

VOTE ON AMENDENT NO. 3114

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the Burr amendment No. 3114.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 56 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Akaka
Alexander
Allard
Allen
Baucus
Bayh
Bennett
Biden
Bingaman
Bond
Boxer
Brownback
Bunning
Burns
Burr
Cantwell
Carper
Chafee
Chambliss
Clinton
Coburn
Cochran
Coleman
Collins
Conrad
Cornyn
Craig
Crapo
Dayton
DeMint
DeWine
Dodd
Dole
Domenici
Dorgan
Durbin
Ensign
Enzi
Feingold
Feinstein
Frist
Graham
Grassley
Gregg
Hagel
Harkin
Hatch
Hutchison
Inhofe
Inouye
Isakson
Jeffords
Johnson
Kennedy
Kerry
Kohl
Kyl
Landrieu
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Lieberman
Lincoln
Lott
Lugar
Martinez
McCain
McConnell
Menendez
Mikulski
Murkowski
Murray
Nelson (FL)
Nelson (NE)
Obama
Pryor
Reed
Reid
Roberts
Rockefeller
Salazar
Santorum
Sarbanes
Schumer
Sessions
Shelby
Smith
Snowe
Specter
Stabenow
Stevens
Sununu
Talent
Thomas
Thune
Vitter
Voinovich
Warner
Wyden

NAYS—1

Byrd

The amendment (No. 3114) was agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM). The time until 1:30 p.m. shall be equally divided.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, at this point, we are going to begin the amending process again. The sequence on our side will be Senator CORNYN, Senator VITTER, then I understand we go to Senator STABENOW and Senator AKAKA.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, on our side it is Senator STABENOW, Senator AKAKA, Senator LINCOLN. I should intercede, Senator VITTER will be paired with Senator LANDRIEU on an amendment for Louisiana.

Mr. GREGG. We will do Senator CORNYN and then Senator VITTER, and then I presume we will go to Senator STABENOW and then Senator AKAKA, then Senator COLLINS, then Senator LINCOLN; right?

Mr. CONRAD. Very well.

Mr. GREGG. I yield Senator CORNYN 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3100

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 3100 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CORNYN], for himself, and Mr. GRAHAM, proposes an amendment numbered 3100.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for reconciliation instructions to the Committee on Finance to reduce mandatory spending)

On page 4, line 15, decrease the amount by $1,279,625,000.

On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by $1,340,125,000.

On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by $1,403,250,000.

On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by $1,469,500,000.

On page 5, line 6, decrease the amount by $1,279,625,000.

On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by $1,340,125,000.

On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $1,403,250,000.

On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $1,469,500,000.

On page 5, line 21, decrease the amount by $1,279,625,000.

On page 5, line 23, decrease the amount by $1,340,125,000.

On page 5, line 25, decrease the amount by $1,403,250,000.

On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $1,469,500,000.

On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $1,279,625,000.

On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $2,619,750,000.

On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $4,023,000,000.

On page 6, line 16, decrease the amount by $5,492,500,000.

On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $1,279,625,000.

On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $2,619,750,000.

On page 7, line 4, decrease the amount by $4,023,000,000.

On page 7, line 6, decrease the amount by $5,492,500,000.

On page 21, line 3, decrease the amount by $1,250,000,000.

On page 21, line 4, decrease the amount by $1,250,000,000.

On page 21, line 7, decrease the amount by $1,250,000,000.

On page 21, line 8, decrease the amount by $1,250,000,000.

On page 21, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,250,000,000.

On page 21, line 12, decrease the amount by $1,250,000,000.

On page 21, line 15, decrease the amount by $1,250,000,000.

On page 21, line 16, decrease the amount by $1,250,000,000.

On page 27, line 3, decrease the amount by $29,625,000.

On page 27, line 4, decrease the amount by $29,625,000.

On page 27, line 7, decrease the amount by $90,125,000.

On page 27, line 8, decrease the amount by $90,125,000.

On page 27, line 11, decrease the amount by $153,250,000.

On page 27, line 12, decrease the amount by $153,250,000.

On page 27, line 15, decrease the amount by $219,500,000.

On page 27, line 16, decrease the amount by $219,500,000.

On page 29, strike lines 14 through 19, and insert the following:

(a) SPENDING RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS.—In the Senate, by May 16, 2006, the committees named in this section shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate. After receiving those recommendations, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(b) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays by $0 in fiscal year 2007, and $3,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2011.

(c) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—The Senate Committee on Finance shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays by $0 in fiscal year 2007 and $10,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2011.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that Senator GRAHAM of South Carolina be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, last year, Congress made some real progress in getting a handle on mandatory spending by passing the Deficit Reduction Act. The Deficit Reduction Act will reduce mandatory spending by nearly $100 billion over the next decade, and it is the first time Congress has taken a hard look at how to find savings and reduce the budget deficit on the mandatory spending side since 1997.

The Deficit Reduction Act is a good first step. My amendment builds on the savings of the Deficit Reduction Act. My amendment lowers the Federal budget deficit, lowers the Federal debt, and does not increase taxes on the American people.

Today, the Federal budget, as we all know, is heavily weighted in favor of mandatory spending—entitlement spending, so to speak. As people live longer and the baby boom generation retires, that spending will increase and eat up a larger and larger share of our budget.

Just in Medicare and Medicaid alone, in the last 5 years, we have seen a 22-percent increase in entitlement spending for those two programs. And if we don't do something in the next 30 years about entitlement spending, we won't have a dime of revenue to pay for other items that are important, such as defense, education, NIH research, and payments to health care providers to reimbursement under Medicare and Medicaid.

My amendment directs the Senate Finance Committee to find $10 billion in additional savings over the next 5 years. One proposal for the Finance Committee to consider under this amendment would be to repeal the stabilization fund included in the Medicare Modernization Act. Let me explain what that is.

This is essentially a bonus provision to preferred provider organizations—insurance companies, in other words—over and above the regular Medicare share to encourage them to participate in the Medicare Program. There simply is no reason to increase the Federal subsidy for these insurance companies over and above regular Medicare payments. We should eliminate that bonus and use that money, which is not necessary, to pay down the debt by $7 billion.

There are other good areas I believe for the Finance Committee to find the $10 billion this amendment would require. The problem is this: If we don't do something about the autopilot our budget is on when it comes to the mandatory side of spending, we have only ourselves to blame because no one is at the wheel, and I am afraid the plane will crash all too soon. We are feeling the squeeze already. The appropriators, I know, are trying to squeeze more and more out of the discretionary spending portion of the budget because as the mandatory and entitlement side rose, there was less and less flexibility for spending on important programs that represent America's priorities under the discretionary portion of the budget.

So I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment. It is one that can be done without detracting from current Medicare spending, but eliminates this bonus provision, this additional cash or Federal subsidy that is provided for under the law that could be saved and be put to more constructive use, showing that we are serious about fiscal responsibility and paying down the debt.

I yield back the remaining time.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise to support this amendment. I think it is an excellent idea and hopefully it will be successful. Stabilization money is certainly available. It is walking-around money. We don't need to have it sitting there, and we should use it for reducing the deficit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, this is a difficult matter for this Senator because I have proposed many times to my colleagues doing away with the stabilization fund. So this amendment puts me in a quandary to the extent that if we can assure that with this amendment we would eliminate the stabilization fund, I would be with the Senator.

The problem we face here is, No. 1, the stabilization fund is $6.2 billion, it is not $10 billion. No. 2, because of the way the budget resolution works, we cannot direct the Finance Committee on how to make the reduction. I wish we could, but we cannot.

What we would be doing, in effect, by the Senator's amendment is telling the Finance Committee to cut $10 billion out of Medicare. They could do that in any number of ways without affecting the stabilization fund at all. In fact, colleagues may recall last year the Senate told the Finance Committee to take out the stabilization fund. I call it the slush fund. I think it is an absolute waste of money. I absolutely agree with the Senator on that point. But we all know at the end of the process, the stabilization fund was left intact because the way the budget process works, we give an instruction about how much finances to cut, but we cannot tell them how to do it.

So I want my colleagues to know that is the circumstance we face with this amendment. I thank the Senator for the good faith of his amendment.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

AMENDMENT NO. 3025

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I rise in support of my filed amendment No. 3025. I will not formally call it up because some revisions to it are still being worked on in conjunction with my colleague from Louisiana, Senator LANDRIEU, and many other leaders in the Senate. But I will speak on this very important topic, and it has to do with meeting in a positive and responsible way our ongoing needs throughout all the coastal areas—not just Louisiana—for hurricane protection and other coastal needs.

Obviously, we have faced many challenges since Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. This is a responsible way to help meet those needs and to help future coastal needs of all coastal States and to do it in a way that we can afford and that we can build into the budget. Rather than having to come back here every 2 months, every 3 months for additional appropriations, wouldn't it be far better to have a stable revenue source that can help us meet these needs directly? The biggest part of that stable revenue source is royalty share, getting our fair share of what we produce off our coasts in terms of offshore oil and gas.

This amendment is a first vital step in that direction because it would look to excess revenue, not anything built into the budget right now, but excess revenue in three areas to use for those vital purposes, not just for Louisiana

but for coastal needs and coastal States in general.

What are these three areas I am talking about? The first would be offshore energy production, future revenues that aren't built into the budget now. The second would be the Federal share of ANWR energy production, should we pass that and say yes to that in the near future. Of course, ANWR is the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge. The third would be DTV revenue that comes in above the current projections for those spectrum auctions.

Again, this is a vital first step that can get us on this path to self-sufficiency, to taking care of these crucial needs without constantly having to come here and look for direct Federal appropriations. We continue to work to perfect this amendment No. 3025 so it can gain support.

AMENDMENT NO. 3078

I formally call up amendment No. 3078, which is a separate amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. VITTER] proposes an amendment numbered 3078.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a reserve fund to prevent catastrophic loss)

On page 43, between lines 22 and 23, insert the following:

SEC. 313. RESERVE FUND TO PREVENT CATASTROPHIC LOSS.

If—

(1) the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment is offered thereto, or if a conference report is submitted thereon, that increases investment in measures designed to prevent catastrophic flood and hurricane damage in coastal areas such that—

(A) the measures, when completed, will likely decrease future expenditures from the Disaster Relief Fund;

(B) the increases do not exceed $10,000,000,000; and

(C) the measures are certified by the President as likely to prevent loss of life and property; and

(2) that Committee is within its allocation as provided under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a));

the Chairperson of the Committee on Budget of the Senate may make the appropriate adjustments in the allocations and aggregates to the extent that such legislation would not increase the deficit for the fiscal year 2007 and for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2011.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, very quickly, this is a separate amendment that would give us flexibility in the context of the budget to account for future levy and hurricane protection projects should the Environment and Public Works Committee pass out a bill that authorizes these important projects. It builds flexibility into the budget through a reserve fund without busting the budget, without doing any harm to the budget numbers and the overall caps. I look forward to my colleagues' support of this flexibility.

I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank the two Senators from Louisiana, especially Senator LANDRIEU, for working with her colleague Senator VITTER on this important amendment for their home State that has obviously been so badly damaged by Hurricane Katrina. I thank Senator LANDRIEU and Senator VITTER for working together in a bipartisan way to begin to rebuild additional resources as their State has been so hard hit.

I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. He and the Senator from New Hampshire have done a fine job leading us through this budget. It is a tough instrument, of course, to negotiate.

Senator VITTER and I are pleased to come to the floor to speak about three particular amendments that will be offered later in the day. One that will be discussed in more detail is a small business amendment. He and I serve together on the Small Business Committee. It has become apparent to us there are many issues regarding the slowness in which the applications our small businesses are putting in but not getting their due checks based on the current law fast enough to get them reestablished. So we will be offering an amendment on a small business issue which I will be cosponsoring with him later.

These two issues we are speaking about this morning on levees are an authorization for an additional $10 billion through the committee Senator VITTER serves on to try to get the authorization levels up. Mr. President, as you know, because you just visited our great State, any number of levy projects throughout all of south Louisiana, from southwest to southeast, from the metropolitan area of New Orleans to the metropolitan area of Thibodaux, Houma, Lake Charles, and rural areas of Cameron and Vermilion Parish, all are short of the levy systems they need to protect themselves and are short of money to our coastal restoration efforts that serve as the first barrier against storms such as Rita and Katrina.

So the second amendment I hope our colleagues will consider is a $10 billion authorization increase in one of the committees Senator VITTER serves on, EPW. A critical third amendment we will discuss later when the details are worked out is a gulf coast recovery fund. That fund will take some additional revenues flowing into the Treasury from additional offshore oil and gas revenues, not specified to any particular place in the gulf, but of course the ANWR revenues and some others that may be coming in if this resolution passes, to support direct funding, coastal impact assistance to the Gulf Coast States: Texas, Mississippi, Alabama, and Louisiana. The Gulf Coast States that serve as America's only energy coast have been devastated by these two storms. Some smart investments now will save us billions of dollars down the road.

Of course, we say from Louisiana and the gulf coast, if it weren't for our Gulf Coast States, we wouldn't even be able to access the great mineral revenues off our shores, right off the southern shore of the United States. So I am pleased to join with my colleague and work through the better part of today on these three amendments.

Then at an additional time later on, with the leadership's go-ahead, we will also hopefully be discussing a defense amendment very important to the Barksdale Air Force Base in Shreveport.

I thank my colleagues for their generosity, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I very much thank the Senator.

I see the Senator from Michigan is on the floor. Would the Senator from Michigan be prepared to present her amendment?

Ms. STABENOW. Yes.

Mr. CONRAD. I yield 3 minutes—is that sufficient time?

Ms. STABENOW. Yes.

Mr. CONRAD. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Michigan, and then next on our side will be Senator AKAKA, and then I think Senator COLLINS is in line, and then Senator LINCOLN.

Senator STABENOW.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Ms. STABENOW. Thank you, Senator CONRAD. Again, thank you for your leadership on the Budget Committee.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Ms. STABENOW. Yes.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, if it is agreeable to the chairman, I have a report I am supposed to do at the luncheon that is going on. If I could give the time at this point to people, would that be appropriate?

Mr. GREGG. I would suggest that we reach a unanimous consent agreement that on the list you identified, everybody be granted 5 minutes.

Mr. CONRAD. Could we do 4 minutes? Because we have a bit of a time constraint, could we do 4 minutes?

Ms. STABENOW. If I might ask, are we asking for 2 minutes per side?

Mr. CONRAD. No. It would be 4 minutes for each of the Senators.

Mr. GREGG. And that will come off your time when the Democratic Members make offers, and when we make offers, it will come off of our time.

Mr. CONRAD. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3141

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Ms. STABENOW] proposes an amendment numbered 3141.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide an assured stream of funding for veteran's health care that will take into account the annual changes in the veterans' population and inflation to be paid for by restoring the pre-2001 top rate for income over $1 million, closing corporate tax loopholes and delaying tax cuts for the wealthy)

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $6,900,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $16,500,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $22,200,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $27,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $31,600,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $6,900,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $16,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $22,200,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $27,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $31,600,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by $6,900,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $16,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $22,200,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $27,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $31,600,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $6,900,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $16,500,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $22,200,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $27,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $31,600,000,000.

On page 23, line 24, increase the amount by $6,900,000,000.

On page 23, line 25, increase the amount by $6,900,000,000.

On page 24, line 3, increase the amount by $16,500,000,000.

On page 24, line 4, increase the amount by $16,500,000,000.

On page 24, line 7, increase the amount by $22,200,000,000.

On page 24, line 8, increase the amount by $22,200,000,000.

On page 24, line 11, increase the amount by $27,000,000,000.

On page 24, line 12, increase the amount by $27,000,000,000.

On page 24, line 15, increase the amount by $31,600,000,000.

On page 24, line 16, increase the amount by $31,600,000,000.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise today to offer an amendment to make veterans health care funding assured and mandatory.

Real security means supporting our troops abroad and making sure they have the body armor and the equipment they need, but it also means supporting them when they come home. It means giving our current and our future veterans the health care they need and deserve.

The amendment I am offering today provides full funding for veterans medical care to ensure that the VA has the resources necessary to provide quality health care in a timely manner to our Nation's sick and disabled veterans.

The problem we face today is that resources for veterans health care are falling behind demand, and we know this because every year we are trying to address the shortfall.

In 1993, there were about 2.5 million veterans in the VA health care system. Today there are more than 7 million veterans enrolled in the system, over half of whom receive care on a regular basis.

Despite the 160-percent increase in patients over the last decade, the VA has received an average of only a 5-percent increase in appropriations during this administration. Some of my colleagues will say this amendment isn't necessary because there have been funding increases over the last several years. They also say we do not need to create another entitlement program. Over the last 2 years, we have seen a 500-percent increase in the number of veterans seeking care from the VA who have been serving in Iraq and serving in Afghanistan. But the administration's budget projects that the VA will treat 109,191 veterans next year, and this falls over 35,000 veterans short of the number of Iraq and Afghanistan veterans the VA currently treats. So we see a 500-percent increase in the number of veterans coming home after serving us bravely in Iraq and Afghanistan, and yet their budget assumes that there are 35,000 fewer—fewer than last year—fewer Iraq and Afghanistan veterans we are going to treat next year. These numbers do not make sense.

Last year's budget is also a case study on why we need to have assured funding for VA health care. In total, Congress provided an additional $3 billion for veterans health care because the administration grossly miscalculated the need for veterans health care.

We need to finally move this into a category where every year those veterans coming home who need health care will know that the dollars are there based on their eligibility, based on their service, based on their need—not based on a debate on the floor in the Congress about how much we are willing to spend to address their health care needs. This should not be a year-to-year debate and commitment; this should be an assured commitment that the dollars will be there. Just as they are for Medicare, for Medicaid, our veterans ought to know that every year, their funding for critical health care services will be assured.

Today's soldiers are tomorrow's veterans. America has made a promise to these brave men and women to provide them with the care they need—not based on a debate on how much we want to spend or calculations year to year on the numbers that folks think may or may not seek care. This ought to be about making sure that every one of our brave men and women coming home, whether it is from the current wars or whether it is our World War II vets or any other war or conflict in which our soldiers have been serving—when they need health care as veterans, we will fulfill our promises to make sure it is there for them.

I urge my colleagues to support this very important amendment, supported by all of the major veterans organizations in this country. It is time to get this done and get it done right.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

AMENDMENT NO. 3071

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I ask that the pending amendment be set aside, and I call up my amendment, No. 3071, and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA], for himself, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. DODD, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. LANDRIEU, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SALAZAR, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. KOHL, proposes an amendment numbered 3071.

Mr. AKAKA. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase funding for Title I grants and reduce debt by closing corporate tax loopholes)

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $180,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $4,860,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $840,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $120,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $180,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $4,860,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $840,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $120,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by $3,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $90,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $2,430,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $420,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $60,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $90,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $2,430,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $420,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $60,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $90,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $2,520,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $2,940,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 6, line 16, decrease the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $90,000,000.
On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $2,520,000,000.
On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $2,940,000,000.
On page 7, line 4, decrease the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 7, line 6, decrease the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 18, line 24, increase the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 18, line 25, increase the amount by $90,000,000.
On page 19, line 4, increase the amount by $2,430,000,000.
On page 19, line 8, increase the amount by $420,000,000.
On page 19, line 12, increase the amount by $60,000,000.
On page 53, line 1, increase the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 53, line 2, increase the amount by $90,000,000.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I thank the managers of this bill for accommodating this amendment. I am very grateful.

I rise with Senators CLINTON, KENNEDY, BINGAMAN, DODD, MENENDEZ, KERRY, LIEBERMAN, CANTWELL, SCHUMER, LANDRIEU, MIKULSKI, SALAZAR, LINCOLN, DURBIN, and KOHL to offer an amendment to the FY 2007 Budget Resolution to restore Title I funding within the No Child Left Behind Act. Certainly, NCLB has come under fire as schools across the country struggle to comply with its requirements, particularly for higher student test scores and teacher qualifications. My colleagues and I have gone on record several times about what we need to do to change the NCLB, to respond to the urgent concerns and needs in all of our communities, including those in my state of Hawaii.

However, today, we are not talking about deficiencies in the Act, but a shortfall in its funding, and about misplaced budget priorities. This budget resolution is similar to the President's budget in its stated priorities. It has debt-financed tax cuts that largely benefit the well-off and special interests. It presents a five year plan, which does not recognize the significant negative impact on revenues that tax cuts will have beyond the next five years. It proposes $14 billion in net mandatory spending cuts. It also omits war costs beyond 2007. We somewhat improved the measure by increasing veterans and defense funding, even if I do not fully agree with the budget gimmick that was used to offset these increases.

However, if we pass this budget as is, we fail our students and teachers once again by underfunding education. The President's FY 2007 budget proposed the largest cut to federal education funding in the Education Department's 26-year history, a $2.1 billion reduction. As approved by the Budget Committee, the budget resolution did not do much better, including the same total amount for discretionary spending, with no guarantee that education would be increased. We must not underfund an area that represents the future of this country. As we debate the need to remain competitive in the world, and worry about other countries overtaking us in producing scientists, engineers, and professionals in other areas important to our industries and national security, we cannot let education take the hit.

The Title I funding shortfall, the amount below authorized levels, is $12.3 billion for FY 2007. This increases the cumulative Title I shortfall since NCLB's enactment to $43.7 billion. Actual funding has barely increased since 2002, which continued to grow the gap between authorized and actual funding. The rightful amount in FY 2007 for Title I, as authorized, should be $25 billion. This budget resolution puts the amount at $12.7 billion.

Mr. President, we are being realistic with our amendment, given our current budgetary climate. We are asking for a modest, responsible increase of almost $3 billion, which is what the President's initial budget requests sought to do. Let me underscore that point—our amendment would do what the President said he wanted to do in previous years, which is to secure an additional $4 billion in funding—$1 billion annually—since FY 2004. Actual increases since then add up to just over $1 billion. In addition, the amendment is fully offset by closing abusive corporate tax loopholes.

If we don't pass our amendment, Mr. President, 3.7 million students will not be served by the Title I program. A total of 29 states stand to lose Title I funding, according to the Department of Education, including Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin.

Another 7 states will be level-funded, including Alaska, Delaware, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming.

The remaining states that gain overall funding will still have many districts—maybe even a majority of those districts—lose funding. In addition, we must not forget history—even if states would gain this year, they likely lost in a previous year. My state of Hawaii is in this last category, for example, having received $47.5 million in FY 2005, and more than a million dollars less in FY 2006 including across-the-board cuts, at about $46.4 million.

To extend this last point further, many states will have cuts a second year in a row, and some would be cut for four or even five years in a row. Twenty-nine states will receive less Title I money than they did two years ago in FY 2005: Alaska, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

Fifteen states will receive less Title I money than they did three years ago in FY 2004: California, Connecticut, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Montana, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

Nine states will receive less Title I money than they did 4 years ago in FY 2003: Connecticut, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, and North Dakota.

Three states will receive less Title I money than they did 5 years ago in FY 2002, which is less than they got before NCLB: Connecticut, Massachusetts, Minnesota.

The District of Columbia will receive less money than it did in FY 2004 or FY 2005.

The Northern Mariana Islands will receive less Title I money in FY 2007 than it had received in any of the years since the NCLB's enactment.

Let me remind my colleagues who we are hurting by failing to adequately fund Title I. This comprehensive education program focuses help on disadvantaged children—those from lower-income families. Title I helps these students meet state and local academic standards, with scientifically-proven instructional support, in basic subjects such as reading, language arts, and mathematics. Title I provides support through guidance, health, nutrition, and social services. It also provides resources for comprehensive school-wide planning, professional development, curriculum development, parental involvement, and acquisition of instructional materials and equipment. Now some may say that federal assistance does not help all schools, only Title I schools, but that is not true—the statewide accountability system required under Title I applies to all public schools. So this program, this central piece of the NCLB, works to meet urgent needs in all of public education.

Students, school faculty and staff, parents, and education administrators have been trying, mightily in some cases, to meet the challenges posed by NCLB and raise student academic achievement. We need to do this—to ensure that our citizens have the knowledge and skills they need to succeed when they leave school and enter the workforce or other pursuits. However, this is very difficult to do if they lack adequate funding.

I can give you concrete examples of how our schools are suffering that I

just heard of this week, when I met with a representative of Hawaii's PTSA, our affiliate of national PTA. Some students in Hawaii are having bread and water for lunch. Why? Because the schools don't have enough resources to ensure that parents know how to apply for reduced and free lunch. Parents who have raised funds to install air conditioners in hot classrooms, to allow students and teachers to concentrate on learning, cannot do so because the education system cannot afford the additional electricity costs. Students are not receiving extra help through tutoring in reading and math because funds are needed for other services that are deemed essential. Hawaii's schools are suffering because they need a greater infusion of resources, and we need to help them from the federal level, as we said we would when we approved the NCLB.

Our schools will continue working to serve our kids and achieving the biggest bang for the buck, which is what education has been forced to do all along. I know this to my core, because I know what it's like to be in the shoes of those in education. I spent nearly two decades in education. I taught in several of Hawaii's elementary, middle, and high schools. Public and private. In the classroom, in music rooms, and in labs. In administration—as a vice principal and a principal. As a representative of Hawaii's principals to a national organization. And as a statewide administrator for the Hawaii Department of Education for the Model Cities program. I know what it's like to stretch the education dollar. However, we must stop being behind the curve with education funding.

Education funding must be a given, not just a goal. Our Title I amendment goes partway toward making that happen, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The American Federation of Teachers, National Education Association, Council of State School Officers, and other education organizations support this increase for Title I. I ask unanimous consent that letters of support from the AFT and NEA be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS,
Washington, DC, March 15, 2006.

Office of the Hon. DANIEL K. AKAKA,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR AKAKA: On behalf of the more than 1.3 million members of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), I am writing in support of your Title I amendment to the fiscal year (FY) 2007 budget resolution.

Knowing that the goals of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) could only be achieved with accountability and dedicated resources, Congress set a funding authorization for the program each year.

In the three years following NCLB's passage, K–12 education programs received average annual increases of $5 billion. However, this steady growth has stalled, as witnessed in the past two appropriations bills (FY 2005 and FY 06). Currently, the gap between authorized and appropriated funds for Title I from FY 02 through FY 06 is $40.3 billion. In addition, the president's budget provides no increase this year for Title I. Given inflation, this would amount to a cut in many districts. It would have a devastating effect on schools that educate large numbers of poor and minority students.

It would also exacerbate a problem that has occurred over the past few years as a result of chronic underfunding. The U.S. Education Department projects that 29 states will lose Title I funding and seven states will be level-funded in FY 07 if the president's budget request is enacted. The remaining states, those that gain funding overall, will see many of their individual school districts—possibly most of them—lose funding. Also, any gains will not make up for funding shortfalls since NCLB's enactment.

Your amendment seeks a relatively modest increase to help us move a step closer toward fully funding Title I. President Bush has acknowledged the need to increase Title I funding by $1 billion in FY 2004 and FY 2005, although actual increases over the past four years have amounted to much less.

At a time when schools and teachers are working hard to meet the requirements of NCLB, this amendment will be a boost for students, teachers, and school districts nationwide. Ensuring that all children have highly qualified teachers and that struggling schools have the tools to improve can't be done on the cheap. Research indicates that recruiting highly qualified teachers for hard-to-staff schools requires improving the physical plant, providing up-to-date textbooks and other learning resources, implementing proven curricula, attracting and retaining exemplary administrative staff and providing professional development and financial resources for teachers.

The AFT applauds you and your colleagues for making education a top priority in this budget. Securing these resources for the upcoming school year is critical to our collective efforts to support and improve our nation's public schools.

Sincerely,

KRISTOR W. COWAN,
Director, Legislation Department.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, March 16, 2006.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the National Education Association's (NEA) 2.8 million members, we would like to express our support for an amendment to be offered by Senator Akaka (D–HI) to the proposed fy07 budget resolution that would allow for an increase of $3 billion for Title I. This amendment would build on the important foundation offered by the just-passed Specter-Harkin amendment, which would replenish key education and health programs recently cut.

The Administration has called Title I the cornerstone of No Child Left Behind. The program provides invaluable funds to help close achievement gaps and maximize student learning. It funds supplemental programs to enable educationally disadvantaged students, particularly those attending schools in high-poverty areas, to meet challenging academic standards. It also pays the salaries of teachers and paraprofessionals, funds pre-K, after-school, and summer school programs, and provides for professional development for teachers and paraprofessionals.

Unfortunately, Title I continues to be significantly underfunded, denying too many eligible students the full services they need to succeed. The budget proposal before the Senate would shortchange Title I by $12.3 billion below the amount authorized in the No Child Left Behind Act. If enacted as proposed, the budget will reduce Title I funding for 29 states and will flat-fund seven additional states. As a result, the budget would deny essential Title I services to some 3.7 million children.

The Akaka amendment would allow for a relatively modest $3 billion increase for Title I, offset by closing abusive corporate tax loopholes. In so doing, it would allow for an important step in the right direction for this critical program.

Again, we urge your support for this important amendment.

Sincerely,

DIANE SHUST,
Director of Government Relations.

RANDALL MOODY,
Manager of Federal Policy and Politics.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is not a sufficient second.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I yield my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

AMENDMENT NO. 3066

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 3066, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maine [Ms. COLLINS], for herself and Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. DEWINE, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. MENENDEZ, proposes an amendment numbered 3066.

Ms. COLLINS. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To ensure that first responder and state and local government grant programs key to our Nation's homeland security are funded at no less than FY 2006 levels and to provide increases for port security, first responder programs, rail/transit security, and National Response Plan Training, offset by discretionary spending reductions)

On page 16, line 21, increase the amount by $4,000,000.

On page 16, line 22, increase the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 17, line 1, increase the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 17, line 22, increase the amount by $488,000,000.

On page 17, line 23, increase the amount by $164,000,000.

On page 18, line 3, increase the amount by $227,000,000.

On page 18, line 7, increase the amount by $75,000,000.

On page 18, line 11, increase the amount by $22,000,000.

On page 24, line 24, increase the amount by $494,000,000.

On page 24, line 25, increase the amount by $171,000,000.

On page 25, line 4, increase the amount by $158,000,000.

On page 25, line 8, increase the amount by $146,000,000.

On page 25, line 12, increase the amount by $19,000,000.

On page 27, line 23, decrease the amount by $986,000,000.

On page 27, line 24, decrease the amount by $338,000,000.

On page 28, line 2, decrease the amount by $386,000,000.

On page 28, line 5, decrease the amount by $221,000,000.

On page 28, line 8, decrease the amount by $41,000,000.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment, which is cosponsored by my colleague from Connecticut, Senator LIEBERMAN—we would like to add as additional cosponsors Senators DEWINE, SNOWE, KENNEDY, and MENENDEZ.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on behalf of an amendment offered by Senator COLLINS and myself to the Fiscal Year 2007 budget resolution to strengthen our homeland security efforts—particularly the ability of first responders to prevent, prepare for, respond to, and recover from terrorist attacks or catastrophic natural disasters.

I have also filed an amendment that would increase the President's Government-wide homeland security budget by $8 billion—an amount still far below what the experts tell us we need to be as safe as we should be. I think the Nation would be best served by a healthier investment in homeland security, but I am happy to join with Senator COLLINS to offer this smaller $986 million proposal as a way to ensure support for first responders; rail, transit, port and cargo security, Coast Guard research and development, and assorted other programs.

September 11, 2001, changed our lives forever. We face new and dangerous threats from our enemies that we must be prepared to deal with. Furthermore, the Federal response to Hurricane Katrina proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that we are still a Nation unprepared for catastrophe. Yet, the Bush administration seems to have turned its back on the lessons of September 11, 2001, and of August 29, 2005, the day Hurricane Katrina made landfall. And this budget resolution, which largely reflects the President's budget proposal, does nothing to indicate otherwise.

We know our first responders lack the training, equipment, and frequently the manpower they need to do their jobs. Most don't even have the basic capability to communicate with one another across jurisdictional and service lines, and Hurricane Katrina demonstrated that sometimes during a major catastrophe they can't communicate at all.

Yet, the President's fiscal year 2007 budget proposal eliminates a number of first responder programs and cuts others, leaving those on the frontlines of the war against terror or on the frontlines of a hurricane, struggling to make due with less. Our amendment would add $860 million to restore and expand first responder programs.

We would restore $400 million for the Law Enforcement Terrorist Prevention Program, which the administration would totally eliminate; $251 million for the FIRE grants, which provide training and equipment to firefighters; $110 million to restore the SAFER Act, which helps recruit, hire and train local firefighters and which the administration would eliminate; $30 million for the Metropolitan Medical Response System which helps prepare local health officials for mass casualties; and $15 million for emergency preparedness grants. We would also add $67 million to the primary homeland security grants for States.

After first responders, port security would get the second highest amount of funding under our amendment—for a total of $427 million for port security. Perhaps one of the unintended consequences of the Dubai Ports World fracas was that it underscored the need for better port security. Ninety-five percent of all our trade flows through our ports, and a terrorist event at one could cause economic havoc. Security experts have also warned that WMD would most likely be smuggled into the country in a shipping container.

Our amendment would commit to strengthening port security by reallocating funding for the Targeted Infrastructure Protection Program to ensure a dedicated $300 million for port security grants. Another $2 million would be set aside to audit the grants to ensure the money is being used properly and efficiently.

Furthermore, we would provide $20 million for additional staff for the C–TPAT program—which permits expedited shipping for known companies that increase their shipping security. Currently, there are just 80 people responsible for overseeing 10,000 applications to the program. We would include $105 million for cutting-edge imaging inspection equipment for better cargo security and $4 million the administration cut from the Coast Guard's R&D program.

Because we know our rail and transit system is wide open, vulnerable, and appealing to terrorists, and because the President's budget eliminates rail and transit grants, we would dedicate $200 million specifically for rail and transit security grants, just as we did for port security grants. Fourteen million Americans ride mass transit each weekday, more than 16 times the number of daily trips taken by Americans on domestic airlines. Let's not fail to learn the lessons of attacks on the London, Madrid, Moscow, Tokyo, and Israeli rail and transit systems.

Our enemies are ruthless and choose their own battlefields in the communities where we live and work. Nature, too, can be ruthless and will strike in unpredictable ways year after year. We must have first responders who are trained and equipped not just to prepare for and respond to catastrophes but to work to prevent them, as well. We worked with a real sense of urgency after September 11, 2001, to secure our Nation. We must summon that same sense of urgency now to close the security gaps that remain. I wish there was a cheap way to do that. But there isn't. It takes money—more money than the administration's budget offers and more money than the majority's budget resolution we're debating this week offers. I urge my colleagues to support these modest proposals so that we can make additional headway toward our goal of being better able to prevent, prepare for, respond to, and recover from the terrorist attacks and natural disasters that are sure to come.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, the Collins-Lieberman amendment would provide $986 million to help prevent terrorist attacks and to enable us to respond more effectively if one does occur. It enjoys the support of a wide range of first responder groups, representing our police and our firefighters.

Our amendment has two components. First, it restores funding to the fiscal year 2006 levels for key grant programs that assist first responders, as well as State and local governments. These are such programs as the Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program, the Metropolitan Medical Response System, emergency management performance grants, the FIRE Act, and SAFER programs.

As this chart prepared by the Congressional Research Service indicates, the aggregate difference between the fiscal year 2006 appropriated amount and the proposed budget request for this year is $395 million. Our amendment ensures that none of the programs listed on this chart would be funded at any less than the level that was appropriated for fiscal year 2006.

Last year, for example, Congress appropriated $550 million for the State Homeland Security Grant Program, a key source of assistance to State and local governments and first responders. This level, I point out, was only half of the fiscal year 2005 enacted level. Communities use these funds for first responder preparation activities such as emergency planning, risk assessments, mutual aid agreements, equipment, training, and exercises.

It is important to realize that the biggest single expenditure of these funds is the purchase of interoperable communications equipment. Therefore, a vote for our amendment is a vote to increase funding for interoperable communications equipment for first responders.

Under the Collins-Lieberman amendment, we would also provide an additional $150 million for the State Homeland Security Grant Program to create a better national response system that will operate more smoothly at the Federal, State, and local level. Our committee's investigation into the preparedness for and response to Hurricane Katrina clearly demonstrated inadequate response and deficiencies in our ability to respond effectively to the

catastrophic events. This is not the time to reduce the Federal Government's commitment to national preparedness.

The budget also shortchanges first responders in other programs, such as the FIRE Act and the SAFER grants. We would take care of that as well as the Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program, one of the programs that focuses on preventing terrorist attacks.

Another important aspect of the Collins-Lieberman amendment deals with port security grants. Unfortunately, the administration's budget does not dedicate a separate funding stream for port security. Instead, it folds port security in with all other transportation and critical infrastructure, thus providing no assurance at all that any money will be provided to strengthen the security of our ports. The estimates are, from the ports administrators, that we need to have $400 million for port security grant funding. Because of budget constraints we don't go that far, but we do include dedicated funding, $300 million in port security grant funding. We have proposed an increase to move the funding level to meeting the identified needs and to help us improve the security of our ports.

There are so many needs, but we have worked very hard to keep the cost of our amendment down. It is fully offset. I hope our colleagues will support this proposal. It also provides funding for a number of other critical infrastructure needs, such as our Nation's rail and transit systems.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and send a message to our first responders that they are a top priority. The additional funding provided by the Collins-Lieberman amendment is an investment we simply must make to strengthen our ability to prevent, detect, and if necessary respond to attacks on our homeland.

I urge support for the amendment, and I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I compliment our colleague from Maine for her conscientious efforts, as well as her fiscally responsible efforts. I ask unanimous consent to add my name to her list of cosponsors and again tell her how much we appreciate all of the many issues that have landed in her lap this year and what an incredible job she has done, working with Senator LIEBERMAN to address those. I ask unanimous consent to add my name as a cosponsor, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3047

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 3047.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. LINCOLN], for herself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mrs. CLINTON, proposes an amendment numbered 3047.

Mrs. LINCOLN. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

To provide $7.8 billion over two years to fund refundable tax credits targeted to small businesses with up to 100 employees so that they may help purchase group health insurance for their low-wage workers, paid for by closing corporate tax loopholes)

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $4,500,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $3,300,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $4,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $3,300,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by $4,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $3,300,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $4,500,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $3,300,000,000.

On page 19, line 24, increase the amount by $4,500,000,000.

On page 19, line 25, increase the amount by $4,500,000,000.

On page 20, line 3, increase the amount by $3,300,000,000.

On page 20, line 4, increase the amount by $3,300,000,000.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I cannot imagine that the rest of my colleagues in this body are not hearing the same thing I hear, as I travel back each week to Arkansas, from my constituents. Always in the top three issues they bring up in the most passionate of ways happens to be how in the world are we in this Nation going to deal with the number of uninsured in this country, particularly in the small business arena?

Those Americans who are working hard, those trying to provide for their families, those keeping the framework and the foundation of our small communities together, those working in small businesses, how are we going to do a better job in this body in helping to provide health insurance for those who are uninsured and their families?

I rise today with my good friend Senator DURBIN to propose an amendment to the budget resolution to provide $7.8 billion over 2 years to fund refundable tax credits targeted to small businesses with up to 100 employees so they may help purchase group health insurance for their low-wage workers.

I ask unanimous consent to add Senators CLINTON, KOHL, and CANTWELL as cosponsors of my amendment, and to take this opportunity as well to note that our amendment is endorsed by the National Association of Business Owners and the Small Business Majority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, my amendment would dedicate funding to help small businesses that are struggling to provide health insurance to their employees, and would do so in a way that is fiscally responsible. My amendment is completely offset by closing corporate tax loopholes that have been agreed upon by the Finance Committee as well as by this entire body, the Senate. These are ways in which we can make fiscally responsible decisions in closing loopholes that exist and pay for something that is absolutely vital to working families.

Unfortunately, the budget resolution before us doesn't specify either an amount to promote expanding health insurance coverage for employees of small businesses or a way to pay for it, which leads me to believe—as do other Americans out there listening to this debate—that this is simply a priority for us.

We cannot continue to act as if this issue doesn't exist. The President has mentioned it year upon year in his State of the Union Addresses, and yet we are seeing increases by the millions of individuals who are finding themselves uninsured. There are nearly 46 million Americans currently without health insurance, including 456,000 Arkansans in my home State of Arkansas. Twenty percent of working-age adults are uninsured. These are people who are working and playing by the rules to provide for their families. This number is so alarming to me that addressing this problem should be a national priority.

Those who lack health insurance don't get access to timely and appropriate health care. They have less access to important screenings and state-of-the-art technology and prescription drugs. Working families need our help with this problem—and they need it now.

Senator DURBIN and I have a bill to help small businesses afford health insurance, and a refundable tax credit to employers as an integral part of our proposal. Our responsible tax credit is targeted to help those who need it the most.

Low-wage workers and small businesses are significantly more likely to be uninsured than high-wage workers, and firms with a high proportion of low-wage workers are much less likely to offer insurance. Our tax credits are targeted to the firms and employees who need the most incentives to purchase health insurance coverage. Our tax credit goes to the employer because small employers believe offering health insurance has a positive impact on recruitment, retention, employees' attitude, performance, and health status.

The budget resolution fails to address this huge problem in our country. The budget is a blueprint, and it should clearly represent America's working families' needs and priorities. It is supposed to reflect what our choices will be when it comes time to spending the tax dollars of this country. This amendment is about priorities.

We must make a priority this growing number of uninsured in our country. They are working families, playing by the rules, trying desperately to contribute to their great Nation. One of

the things we can do is provide the employers the incentive they need to provide the kind of health insurance working families can use and need.

The underlying proposal Senator DURBIN and I have offered presents working families' ability to have the similar kind of health insurance that I and all of the Federal employees here have access to. What greater opportunity to provide greater choice at a lower cost. This is the tool that can make that happen. Providing a tax incentive to small businesses to be able to purchase and assist their employees—their low-wage workers—with the ability to engage in the insurance market and provide the ability to mitigate against their health care and their health care costs is absolutely essential, not just for the quality of life of working Americans but also think of what it does for our economy.

We have a great opportunity in this budget to set priorities that are important to the working families of this country. I urge my colleagues, let us come together and do something for our small businesses and working families—and do something now.

I ask my colleagues to support our amendment and look forward to the opportunity we have to do something about the escalating costs of health care and what it means to working families in this Nation.

I request the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

At the moment there is not a sufficient second.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, we will have no trouble getting a sufficient second.

Perhaps we could give a second to the yeas and nays asked for by the Senator from Arkansas at this time. There now appears to be a sufficient second.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask the Parliamentarian if he could give us a breakdown on the time remaining between now and 1:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority has 24 minutes 32 seconds, the minority has 15 minutes 6 seconds.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, we have calls out to two other offices of Members who indicated an interest in offering amendments in this time period.

As we have heard from the Parliamentarian, we only have 15 minutes left on our side. When we put in a quorum call, that time will be charged equally. I alert those Senators whose offices have been called that time is rapidly running through the hourglass. I hope very much those who have been called and who have asked for time will come. Time is rapidly evaporating.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3106

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague.

I come to the floor today to offer an amendment on behalf of rural America. If there is anything that has been consistent in this administration's budget, it has been that there has been more asked from rural America in terms of the burden of cuts that have happened and a disproportionate share of the labor-intensive ideas of how we are going to deal with incredible spending.

I offer this amendment on behalf of rural America. I thank Senators SALAZAR, PRYOR, HARKIN, and KOHL for joining me in this effort.

I am pleased to ask unanimous consent to add Senators DURBIN and SCHUMER as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, our amendment would restore approximately $2 billion in discretionary cuts proposed for programs administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in fiscal year 2007. To pay for these investments in rural America, our amendment would raise the discretionary cap by $2 billion and offset these expenditures by closing corporate tax loopholes which have passed the Senate on numerous occasions.

The proposed discretionary cuts for USDA impact a variety of conservation, rural development, nutrition, and forestry programs that are vitally important to our communities across this great Nation.

Mr. President, you and all other Members of this Senate have rural areas in your States and know the difficult times they are going through. They do not have the tax base. They may not have the corporate citizens in those areas that help them build this economy. These programs are vital to them in terms of developing the kind of economy they want and can have. They are not asking to be a major metropolitan area. They are simply asking to be the best they can possibly be.

The discretionary spending would decline $208 million in fiscal year 2007 in conservation. Rural development would see a decline of $421 million less than in fiscal year 2007, and research would see a 14.6 percent reduction from the fiscal year 2006 appropriations.

I ask all of my colleagues, whether you represent a major metropolitan area or rural America, you know the fabric of this country depends on all of us. Please do not ask for a disproportionate share of rural America, and do not devastate the incredible advances they have already been able to make. Let us help them grow with the rest of America in their great effort.

I urge my colleagues to support me in the WIC Program, the nutrition program, the conservation program, and all of the others that rural America depends on.

AMENDMENT NO. 3136, AS MODIFIED

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President I call up an amendment at the desk. It is a substitute on the energy amendment I offered earlier. I ask unanimous consent to modify my previous amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 3136), as modified, is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide a reserve fund for bold energy legislation that is deficit neutral)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

"SEC. . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ENERGY LEGISLATION.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that would reduce our nation's dependence on foreign sources of energy, expand production and use of alternative fuels and alternative fuel vehicles, promote renewable energy development, improve electricity transmission, encourage responsible development of domestic oil and natural gas resources, and reward conservation and efficiency, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit in fiscal year 2007 or over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2011, and provided that the committee or committees of jurisdiction are within their 302(a) allocations.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Chair.

I ask the Parliamentarian to give us an update on the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority has 22 minutes 30 seconds, the minority has 9 minutes 5 seconds.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3106

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment numbered 3106 which I described to my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. LINCOLN], for herself, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. KOHL, proposes an amendment numbered 3106.

Mrs. LINCOLN. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To restore the discretionary budget for the Department of Agriculture with an offset achieved by closing corporate tax loopholes)

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $1,177,000,000.
On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $439,000,000.
On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $221,000,000.
On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $107,000,000.
On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $57,000,000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $1,177,000,000.
On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $439,000,000.
On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $221,000,000.
On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $107,000,000.
On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $57,000,000.
On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by $2,029,000,000.
On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $1,177,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $439,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $221,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $107,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $57,000,000.
On page 13, line 21, increase the amount by $916,000,000.
On page 13, line 22, increase the amount by $540,000,000.
On page 14, line 1, increase the amount by $220,000,000.
On page 14, line 5, increase the amount by $101,000,000.
On page 14, line 9, increase the amount by $37,000,000.
On page 14, line 13, increase the amount by $18,000,000.
On page 14, line 21, increase the amount by $384,000,000.
On page 14, line 22, increase the amount by $295,000,000.
On page 15, line 1, increase the amount by $67,000,000.
On page 15, line 5, increase the amount by $17,000,000.
On page 15, line 9, increase the amount by $3,000,000.
On page 15, line 21, increase the amount by $95,000,000.
On page 15, line 22, increase the amount by $71,000,000.
On page 16, line 1, increase the amount by $22,000,000.
On page 17, line 22, increase the amount by $296,000,000.
On page 17, line 23, increase the amount by $12,000,000.
On page 18, line 3, increase the amount by $79,000,000.
On page 18, line 7, increase the amount by $96,000,000.
On page 18, line 11, increase the amount by $63,000,000.
On page 18, line 15, increase the amount by $35,000,000.
On page 19, line 24, increase the amount by $104,000,000.
On page 19, line 25, increase the amount by $93,000,000.
On page 20, line 4, increase the amount by $11,000,000.
On page 21, line 24, increase the amount by $234,000,000.
On page 21, line 25, increase the amount by $166,000,000.
On page 22, line 4, increase the amount by $40,000,000.
On page 22, line 8, increase the amount by $8,000,000.
On page 22, line 12, increase the amount by $4,000,000.
On page 22, line 16, increase the amount by $3,000,000.
On page 53, line 1, increase the amount by $2,029,000,000.
On page 53, line 2, increase the amount by $1,177,000,000.

Mrs. LINCOLN. I appreciate my colleagues' attention on this and encourage their support in supporting rural America.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VITTER). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3078, 3041, 3134, 3045, 3123, AND 3136, AS MODIFIED

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent the following amendments be agreed to en bloc: Amendment 3078, Senator VITTER and Senator LANDRIEU; amendment 3041, Senator BAUCUS; amendment 3134, Senators SNOWE, VITTER and KERRY; amendment 3045, Senator LAUTENBERG; amendment 3123, Senator COLEMAN; amendment 3136, as modified, Senator CONRAD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3078) was agreed to.

The amendments were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3041

(Purpose: To provide funding for an Internet Crimes Against Children task force in Montana)

On page 24, line 24, increase the amount by ''$250,000''.
On page 24, line 25, increase the amount by ''$250,000''.
On page 27, line 23, decrease the amount by ''$250,000''.
On page 27, line 24, decrease the amount by ''$250,000''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3134

(Purpose: To prevent an increase in interest rates paid by disaster victims, and to increase funding for the SBA's Microloans, Small Business Development Centers, HUBZones, and other small business development programs, and to offset the cost through a reduction in funds under function 920)

On page 15, line 21, increase the amount by $130,000,000.
On page 15, line 22, increase the amount by $92,000,000.
On page 16, line 1, increase the amount by $30,000,000.
On page 16, line 5, increase the amount by $7,000,000.
On page 16, line 9, increase the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 27, line 23, decrease the amount by $130,000,000.
On page 27, line 24, decrease the amount by $92,000,000.
On page 28, line 2, decrease the amount by $30,000,000.
On page 28, line 5, decrease the amount by $7,000,000.
On page 28, line 8, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3045

(Purpose: To Add $8 million to Function 300 (Environment and Natural Resources) for Highlands Land Acquisition. Fully offset with Function 920)

On page 13, line 21, increase the amount by $8,000,000.
On page 13, line 22, increase the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 14, line 1, increase the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 14, line 5, increase the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 14, line 9, increase the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 14, line 13, increase the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 27, line 23, decrease the amount by $8,000,000.
On page 27, line 24, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 28, line 2, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 28, line 5, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 28, line 8, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 28, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3123

(Purpose: To increase funding to fully fund the Clean Coal Power Initiative)

On page 12, line 21, increase the amount by $200,000,000.
On page 12, line 22, increase the amount by $200,000,000.
On page 27, line 23, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.
On page 27, line 24, increase the amount by $200,000,000.

The amendment (No. 3136), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I am deeply disappointed that this budget resolution assumes deep cuts and unprecedented fees for the Small Business Administration, the SBA. The administration's request of $624 million is insufficient to meet the needs of small businesses in this country that need access to capital, counseling, and Federal contracts. By the SBA's own calculation, the request is $18 million less than what was available to the Agency last year when congressional initiatives and disaster supplementals are excluded. If this budget is adopted, the Agency will have been cut more than 37 percent since 2001. In context, that means it will have suffered the largest cuts of all 24 Federal agencies.

To address this shortfall, I introduced S.A. 3072 to increase SBA's fiscal year 2007 budget of $624 million by $151 million, for a total of $775 million. The amendment would have paid for this increased spending by closing abusive corporate tax loopholes and would, among other things, have prevented the administration from increasing the cost of disaster loans, from imposing a new fee on SBA's largest loan and venture capital programs, from eliminating the SBA's microloan programs, and from weakening business assistance to women, minorities, veterans, Native Americans, and those trying to cut through redtape to contract with the Federal Government.

This budget resolution comes after 5 years of drastic budget cuts which have

eroded SBA's core programs and left the Agency with one of the worst morale problems in the Federal Government. SBA's largest lending program, the 7(a) program, is now more expensive than ever for small business borrowers and lenders, and the administration is proposing to add new ''administrative fees'' for larger 7(a) loans, 504 loans, and SBIC or venture capital deals. These fees are the first time the SBA has attempted to pass along administrative costs to lenders and small business borrowers, but the administration is pushing for them because they will generate $7 million in savings. We are told that some 7(a) borrowers will pay $625 more per loan, some 504 borrowers will pay $1,625 per loan, and the majority of companies that get an SBIC investment will pay $45,000 more. This is in addition to the excessive fees these small business borrowers already pay to cover the loan subsidy cost. This would set a bad precedent. To prevent the administration from imposing a new fee on small business borrowers, my amendment provided $7 million to the SBA's budget for next year to offset this proposal.

Deep budget cuts for SBA have also meant less transparency and accountability when it comes to the oversight of small business contracting. After pressure from our Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, the SBA hired additional procurement center representatives, PCRs—the Government officials responsible for monitoring the bundling of large contracts and for helping small businesses cut through redtape to compete for Federal contracts—now bringing the number of PCRs nationwide up to 58. But many of these are not full-time PCRs. To avoid further reports of contracting abuses, large businesses receiving small business contracts, and Federal agencies missing their small business goals, my amendment provided $10 million for 100 additional PCRs to ensure robust contracting oversight throughout the Nation.

For the fifth year in a row, this budget continues on the path of providing unrealistic funding by cutting critical programs, such as the Small Business Development Centers or SBDCs, Women's Business Centers and SCORE, forcing SBA's counseling partners to spend fewer hours with clients because the Federal matching grant isn't keeping pace with inflation or demand. Despite the budget's failure to account for inflation costs, these programs continue to play an integral role in helping entrepreneurs from underrepresented communities. These cuts, when combined with 5 years of budget cuts for the SBA as a whole, would leave the SBA ill-prepared to meet the demands of the growing entrepreneurial sector. I strongly oppose flat funding these resources for small businesses and so proposed an additional $23 million in my amendment to bring Small Business Development Centers from the outdated $87.1 funding level to $110 million, proposed $4.95 million to bring SCORE funding to $7 million, and $4.7 million to bring the Women's Business Centers to a level of $16.5 million.

All of this pales in comparison to the mismanagement of the response to recovery of the gulf coast region. The SBA's disaster loan program, essential to the recovery of business owners, homeowners, and renters after a disaster, almost ran out of money twice in February. Instead of getting their fiscal house in order like every American family must do, the President now proposes to raise the cost of disaster loans and no longer guarantee our most vulnerable borrowers fixed interest rates. Although they could still have up to 30 years to pay off a loan, if they don't pay it off in 5 years, the interest rate will go up. Instead of telling us how this will help disaster victims, we are told this will save the SBA an estimated $41 million. We should not be saving money on the backs of disaster victims. Instead, we should help them to rebuild their homes and businesses. To prevent raising disaster loan interest rates, my amendment provided $41 million to the SBA's budget for next year.

The $151 million in my amendment would have provided real money to our appropriators and to small business programs in desperate need of funding. Unfortunately, this amendment did not garner bipartisan support. While I am disappointed with this outcome, I am pleased that we were able to work out a bipartisan compromise with Senator SNOWE, the chair of the Small Business Committee. Our compromise, S.A. 3134, would increase the SBA fiscal year 2007 budget by $130 million, and although it would not add any additional funds to the budget resolution, it is a bipartisan effort to address many of the issues that my amendment 3072 attempted to address. There is bipartisan support for the 7(j) technical assistance program and the HUBZONE Program, which Senator BOND from Missouri worked hard to put in place and I joined with him in cosponsoring it when he was chairman for SBDCs and SCORE and Women's Business Centers; for the Microloan Program and microloan technical assistance, both of which the President has tried to eliminate for several years now. We all support U.S. Export Assistance Centers and Veterans Business Development, Small Business Innovation Research, and Small Business Technology Transfer Program. While I would have liked to have seen higher funding levels for the PRIME and New Markets Venture Capital Program, I am glad that our amendment reflects continued funding for these vital programs. We made a strong bipartisan statement that minority lending numbers must be increased, with about $1 million more toward Native-American outreach. And we agreed to reject the proposals to raise the cost of disaster loans and to impose a new fee on the lending and venture capital programs. Overall, amendment 3134 is sending an important signal to all that there is broad bipartisan support to increase funding for these vital small business programs.

Mr. President, I thank my colleagues, Senators LANDRIEU, LIEBERMAN, LEVIN, NELSON of Florida, VITTER, and COLEMAN for joining us to cosponsor this amendment, the entire Senate for agreeing to the amendment, and Senators CONRAD and GREGG for their help in putting together a more realistic budget for small businesses.

Mr. GREGG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, could we get an update on the time situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Certainly. The minority has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CONRAD. Two minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Correct. The majority has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. CONRAD. I ask the chairman, could I get 2 additional minutes to give to Senator KERRY?

Mr. GREGG. Sure.

Mr. CONRAD. The chairman, once again, is gracious to provide another 2 minutes. I ask unanimous consent for 2 minutes from his time to our time and I give 4 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I am grateful to both of the managers and appreciate the courtesy.

AMENDMENT NO. 3143

Mr. President, I have an amendment which I send to the desk and ask for its appropriate consideration in the line of votes, as we decide on that later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] proposes an amendment numbered 3143.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To eliminate increased fees and copayments for retired military healthcare)

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $592,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $1,619,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $2,188,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $2,685,000,000.

On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $3,271,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $592,000,000.
On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $1,619,000,000.
On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $2,188,000,000.
On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $2,685,000,000.
On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $3,271,000,000.
On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by $735,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $1,862,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $2,322,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $2,816,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $3,424,000,000.
On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $592,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $1,619,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $2,188,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $2,685,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $3,271,000,000.
On page 9, line 20, increase the amount by $735,000,000.
On page 9, line 21, increase the amount by $592,000,000.
On page 9, line 24, increase the amount by $1,862,000,000.
On page 9, line 25, increase the amount by $1,619,000,000.
On page 10, line 3, increase the amount by $2,322,000,000.
On page 10, line 4, increase the amount by $2,188,000,000.
On page 10, line 7, increase the amount by $2,816,000,000.
On page 10, line 8, increase the amount by $2,685,000,000.
On page 10, line 11, increase the amount by $3,424,000,000.
On page 10, line 12, increase the amount by $3,271,000,000.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, the President's budget proposal includes a concept to increase TRICARE—this is the DOD, Department of Defense, health care program—fees and copayments for military retirees under the age of 65 and for their dependents.

All of us recognize there is this spiraling cost to health care. I understand that. And it affects everything we are doing in the country. The Department of Defense is, needless to say, no different. It has those increases. But the answer is not found in tripling the fees for retired officers, doubling them for senior enlisted retirees, and demanding more from every military retiree under the age of 65 who uses the health care system, when you look at the other costs that are already going up for all of those folks.

Most importantly, there are a series of better ways that have been recommended to bring down the cost of health care for those retirees. So you do not have to go immediately to fees and copayments in order to solve the problem of the increase in costs.

In successive budget requests, the Bush administration has asked for increased fees and copayments for veterans health care, which is increasingly shifting the burden of that care from some veterans on to others, and it is driving some veterans out of the system altogether, which is, obviously, not fair.

My amendment will restore the funding for TRICARE so that military retirees are not saddled with these increased costs and fees. We pay for it by closing a number of tax loopholes. I think by doing so, we keep faith with people who have served our country for 20 years or more.

They did not ask to change the terms of their commitment to the military when things got tough, and I do not think we should be ignoring and changing our commitment to them now.

Mr. President, I yield back such time as may remain.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, we are 10 minutes away from the big show, which may go on for a long time. It may be a big, long show. In any event, I want to alert Members we are going to go to 10-minute votes. We are going to be holding the 10-minute votes as strictly as possible. The first vote will, obviously, not be 10 minutes. And we are going to start voting at 1:30. We have pending so many amendments that we could be here well into the evening. Cooperation is needed if people do not want to be here well into tomorrow morning.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, thank you. And I thank the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee.

AMENDMENT NO. 3127

Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 3127 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HAGEL] proposes an amendment numbered 3127.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a reserve fund for a Comprehensive Entitlement Reform Commission)

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. _____. RESERVE FUND FOR A COMPREHENSIVE ENTITLEMENT REFORM COMMISSION.

If—

(1) the Committee on Finance of the Senate reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment is offered thereto or if a conference report is submitted thereon, that establishes a Comprehensive Entitlement Reform Commission for the purpose of conducting a comprehensive review of the Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid programs and making recommendations to sustain the solvency and stability of these programs for future generations; and

(2) that committee is within its allocation as provided under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974;

the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations and aggregates to the extent that such legislation would not increase the deficit for fiscal year 2007 and the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2011.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators Isakson and Chambliss be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, last October, I introduced legislation, S. 1889, to create a bipartisan entitlement reform commission. Senator ISAKSON cosponsored my legislation, and Representative JOHN TANNER joined me in introducing this legislation in the House of Representatives.

In January, the President called on Congress to create such a commission in his State of the Union Address. The amendment I am offering today responds to the President's request.

My amendment establishes a reserve fund that would allow Congress to pass legislation later this year forming a bipartisan entitlement reform commission. This bipartisan commission would review America's three major entitlement programs—Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid—and make comprehensive recommendations on how to stabilize and keep solvent these programs for future generations.

The entitlement course that we are currently on is unsustainable. Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid have been vital components for millions of Americans as they have found a happier retirement. However, over the next 75 years, these three programs represent a $42 trillion unfunded mandate for the American taxpayer.

The Social Security trust fund faces a $4 trillion unfunded commitment and will pay out more money than it takes in beginning around 2017. The fund will be exhausted by 2041. The Medicare Part A trust fund—hospital insurance—faces an almost $9 trillion unfunded commitment and will be exhausted by 2020.

Where is the money to pay for these commitments going to come from? We must deal with these challenges today while we still have time and constructive options. To leave future generations burdened with paying for huge

entitlement commitments when they will be competing in a far more competitive world than exists today would be dangerously irresponsible.

This is not a Republican or a Democratic problem. This affects us all. Most significantly, it affects the most vulnerable in our society. Creating this commission will start us down the road to dealing with this problem and will protect the next generation from facing Draconian choices in their future.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment today.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I assume I have no time remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The remainder of the time is controlled by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New Hampshire for 2 minutes so I might offer an amendment.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from North Dakota 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank the chairman again for his courtesy.

AMENDMENT NO. 3148

Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Nebraska that while on this side we agree that we have long-term challenges, very deep long-term challenges, with the fiscal health of the country, we believe the amendment the Senator from Nebraska has offered is too narrow in scope.

Mr. President, for that reason, I send an amendment to the desk to be considered at the same time as the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska. Basically, the difference is this: We think everything ought to be on the table. We think everything ought to be on the table, not just entitlements but domestic discretionary spending, the revenue side of the equation, that all ought to be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator briefly allow the clerk to formally report.

Mr. CONRAD. I will be happy to.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] proposes an amendment numbered 3148.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To create a deficit-neutral reserve fund for addressing the long term fiscal challenges facing our nation, by creating a bipartisan commission or process to consider all parts of the budget, with everything on the table for discussion)

SEC. ____. RESERVE FUND FOR ADDRESSING THE LONG-TERM FISCAL CHALLENGES FACING THE NATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or a conference report thereon, that would provide for the bipartisan leadership of the House and Senate to work with the President to establish a commission (or other mutually agreeable process) to address the long-term fiscal challenges facing the nation, provided that such commission or process—

(1) Addresses these long-term fiscal challenges in a manner in which both political parties are represented equally, and

(2) Considers all parts of the budget by putting everything on the table for discussion

provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit for fiscal year 2007 and the period of fiscal years 2007 to 2011.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may continue.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a letter printed in the RECORD from AARP in opposition to the Hagel amendment, indicating they agree that the Hagel amendment is too narrow in scope, and that we ought to have a broader look at all of the problems facing our fiscal future, not just focus on one part.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AARP,
March 16, 2006.

Hon. KENT CONRAD,
Ranking Minority Member, Budget Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CONRAD: The Senate will shortly consider an amendment regarding a narrowly focused commission to address the long-term challenges facing Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid. AARP agrees that we must confront the challenges and opportunities posed by the aging of the baby boom generation, but a commission focused primarily on the fiscal impact of our critical health and income security programs overlooks the important role they play in the lives of millions of Americans of all ages.

Commissions have been most effective in laying out policy options when they have been balanced, established without preconditions, given a mandate to address the underlying causes of problems, and provided all sides with an opportunity to be heard. A commission to address our long-term fiscal challenges has merit provided it examines the full scope of our budgetary policy, including the revenue needed to ensure the health and income security of all Americans.

Most important to AARP and its 36 million members, the commission must recognize that ultimately the solutions must be about people. A commission's recommendations should put us on a path to secure the future ability of Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid to continue to provide a foundation for the health and retirement security of all generations as well as guide the way to sound long-term budget policies.

The current amendment offered by Senator Hagel does not meet all of these criteria. Therefore, AARP cannot support this amendment.

Sincerely,

DAVID P. SLOANE,
Senior Managing Director, Government Relations & Advocacy.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, just for the edification of our colleagues because it is going to get a little confusing around here with all the amendments we have, we are going to begin the amendment voting process with the amendment of Senator LIEBERMAN on homeland security. That will be followed by Senator CLINTON's amendment, followed by Senator SPECTER's amendment on education, followed by the amendment of Senator REED of Rhode Island on LIHEAP, followed by Senator LAUTENBERG's amendment on TSA fees, followed by Senator SARBANES's amendment on function 300, followed by Senator DORGAN's amendment on tribal issues, followed by Senator CORNYN's amendment on reconciliation, followed by Senator STABENOW's amendment on veterans, followed by Senator AKAKA's amendment on title I, followed by Senator COLLINS's amendment on homeland security, followed by Senator LINCOLN's amendment on small business—oh, we are stopping at Senator COLLINS's amendment, and then we are going to order the next group of amendments.

So that is the basic concept.

Mr. CONRAD. Might we put in a quorum call? We have a little bit of a glitch.

Mr. GREGG. Yes.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I wish to amend the prior list of how we will proceed with votes. We will begin with Senator REED and his LIHEAP amendment. We will follow that with Senator CLINTON on health care, followed by Senator SPECTER, and then we will go to Senator LIEBERMAN. Then the list will continue as outlined in the prior discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent that for the amendments which are pending, there be 2 minutes equally divided prior to each vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that no second degrees be in order, with the exception of the Clinton amendment which might be subject to a second degree or further side by side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 1 minute.

AMENDMENT NO. 3074

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this amendment would raise the allocation for LIHEAP to the statutorily authorized $5.1 billion. It recognizes the fact that energy prices have been going up and that we are likely not to see a mild winter again next year; that we can expect right now to need more resources. Just a few weeks ago, we were on the floor of the Senate trying to raise the emergency funding for LIHEAP because of the intersection of cold temperatures and the increased cost of fuel. If we do pass this amendment, it will increase the allocation of resources not just to the cold States but to the warm States. This will provide significant resources for those States such as Alabama, Louisiana, and Nevada that need the assistance in the summertime for air-conditioning.

I urge my colleagues to pass my amendment. We know it is going to be a problem next year. The funds in the President's budget are insufficient. We have to stand up and make sure we take care of the vulnerable people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, we made a very strong commitment to LIHEAP a few weeks ago. We passed an additional billion dollars on the Senate floor. In other vehicles, we have passed even more money for LIHEAP. This amendment does not fund LIHEAP because nothing in this bill is binding on the Appropriations Committee. What it does do, however, is raise the cap by $1 billion and raise taxes by $1 billion. It will be up to the Appropriations Committee to decide whether they are going to fund LIHEAP at this year's level or next year's level or last year's level. The history is pretty strong. LIHEAP gets well funded around here and you can pretty much presume that the Appropriations Committee will do that. But they will do it within the cap, and that is the way it should be. Therefore, I hope Members will reject this amendment because it is basically a tax-and-spend amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be deemed to have been ordered on all amendments that are proceeding here.

Mr. CONRAD. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second. The yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent that seconds be deemed to have been approved for all the yeas and nays for the balance of the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 3074.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 57 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Akaka	Dorgan	Menendez
Baucus	Durbin	Mikulski
Bayh	Feingold	Murray
Biden	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Harkin	Nelson (NE)
Boxer	Inouye	Obama
Byrd	Jeffords	Pryor
Cantwell	Johnson	Reed
Carper	Kennedy	Reid
Chafee	Kerry	Rockefeller
Clinton	Kohl	Salazar
Coleman	Landrieu	Sarbanes
Collins	Lautenberg	Schumer
Conrad	Leahy	Snowe
Dayton	Levin	Specter
DeWine	Lieberman	Stabenow
Dodd	Lincoln	Wyden

NAYS—49

Alexander	Domenici	McConnell
Allard	Ensign	Murkowski
Allen	Enzi	Roberts
Bennett	Frist	Santorum
Bond	Graham	Sessions
Brownback	Grassley	Shelby
Bunning	Gregg	Smith
Burns	Hagel	Stevens
Burr	Hatch	Sununu
Chambliss	Hutchison	Talent
Coburn	Inhofe	Thomas
Cochran	Isakson	Thune
Cornyn	Kyl	Vitter
Craig	Lott	Voinovich
Crapo	Lugar	Warner
DeMint	Martinez	
Dole	McCain	

The amendment (No. 3074) was agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CONRAD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3115 WITHDRAWN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I hope this sets a good example for the 40-odd amendments we have left. I ask unanimous consent that the Reid-Clinton amendment be withdrawn, and the Ensign amendment—it has not been filed yet, I believe—will not be offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, we will now go to the Specter amendment. Senator SPECTER and those in opposition had not expected this amendment to come up so quickly. I hate to slow the voting down.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, if we could ask our colleagues, we know the list that has been put in, and if colleagues who have amendments about to be considered will be closely attentive to what is happening here so we don't have dead time, that would be very helpful to the process.

After this amendment, next is the Lieberman amendment. So we alert Senator LIEBERMAN and his staff. Then we will have the Lautenberg amendment. If those Senators can be ready to go.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I see the cosponsor of the amendment is on the Senate floor. Would he like to take the time allocated to him?

Mr. HARKIN. We have 30 seconds?

Mr. GREGG. The Senator has a minute. Proponents of the amendment have a minute.

AMENDMENT NO. 3048

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 1 minute on each side on the Specter-Harkin amendment No. 3048, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Who seeks recognition? The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, Senator HARKIN and I have submitted this amendment, joined by 27 cosponsors, which would add $7 billion to the fund for education, health, and workers' safety. This account has been decimated since fiscal year 2005 with a loss of some $15.7 billion when we consider the cuts and the failure to have an inflationary increase.

Health and education are the two major capital assets of the country. We have gone beyond the fat, beyond the muscle, beyond the bone, and into the marrow. This funding will help us a little, not really enough. We ask our colleagues to support it.

I yield to Senator HARKIN.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his great leadership in the areas of health and education, especially medical research. This amendment only takes us back to 2005. That is all it does. It sets the level back to where it was in 2005. It is a very modest proposal.

I hope we can have a strong vote on this amendment to get the money we need for Pell grants, for NIH, for the Centers for Disease Control—all the programs that are so necessary to our country.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise in support of this amendment to provide an additional $7 billion for critical health, education, training and low-income programs. This budget has all the wrong priorities. Instead of easing the burden on middle-class families and helping to curb the costs of education and health care, President Bush and the Republicans want to cut funding for these programs by more than $4 billion and spend billions on tax breaks for multimillionaires. This amendment would restore cuts to some of the most vital programs in our country programs like No Child Left Behind, Pell

grants, NIH, and nursing education. It is my job as a U.S. Senator to look out for the day-to-day needs of Marylanders and the long-term needs of the Nation, and this amendment takes us closer to both of these goals.

Our middle-class families are stressed and stretched. Families in my State of Maryland are worried—they are worried about their jobs, they are terrified of losing their health care, and they don't know how they are going to afford to send their kids to college. Families are looking for help and President Bush doesn't offer them much hope. His budget would freeze the maximum Pell grant at $4,050 for the fourth year in a row. Twenty years ago, Pell grants covered 80 percent of average costs at 4-year public colleges. Now, they cover only 40 percent. If Pell grants remain the same for another year, many students will be forced to take out more student loans and some won't be able to go to school at all. Our students are graduating with so much debt, it is like their first mortgage. The average undergraduate student debt from college loans is almost $19,000. College is part of the American dream; it shouldn't be part of the American financial nightmare.

We need to do more to help middle-class families afford college. We need to immediately increase the maximum Pell Grant to $4,500 and double it over the next 6 years. We need to make sure student loans are affordable. And we need a bigger tuition tax credit for the families stuck in the middle who aren't eligible for Pell grants but still can't afford college.

America needs a public school system that works. I support the goals of No Child Left Behind: a good teacher in every classroom, making sure every student is proficient in math and reading, and fighting against the soft bigotry of low expectations. But to do that, schools need help from the Federal Government. Schools need resources for smaller classes, teacher training, and meeting special needs—like bilingual education or special education. Yet the Republican budget doesn't give schools the funds to do the job. It falls $15.4 billion short of what we promised for No Child Left Behind. It shortchanges schools and shortchanges our children. That is wrong.

I have heard from teachers and parents from all over Maryland. They are worried about how they are going to meet all the requirements in No Child Left Behind. They all tell me that they are worried about whether their school will make the grade—especially in this time of budget cuts and budget crunches.

No Child Left Behind placed the burden on schools to improve. I know the teachers and school officials are doing their best to turn struggling schools around. But they can't do it alone. They need encouragement, support, and resources. That is why this amendment is so important. We must make sure no child is left out of the budget.

NIH is a jewel in the Nation's crown. As the Senator from Maryland, I am proud that NIH is in my home State. The investments we are making in biomedical research today have the potential to pay priceless returns for people across this country. That is why I strongly supported the bipartisan doubling of the NIH budget over 5 years to $27 billion. This goal was met in 2003, but our work is not done. We must continue to invest in biomedical research and support continued increases of the NIH budget, so that the research that scientists are doing will continue to help people live longer, healthier lives.

The Republican budget level funds the NIH at $28.3 billion, which is $62 million less than in fiscal year 2005. As a result, the total number of NIH-funded research project grants would drop by 642, or 2 percent, below last year's level. The budget would cut funding for 18 of the 19 institutes. Funding for the National Cancer Institute would drop by $40 million, and funding for the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute would drop by $21 million. Over the years, the American people have invested in NIH. It is paying off in improved prevention, diagnosis, and treatments for diseases. We must continue to invest in biomedical research.

Today, our Nation faces a shortage of nearly 500,000 nurses. As our population continues to grow and age, the need for nurses will continue to increase. The Department of Labor reported in the Winter 2005–2006 Occupational Outlook Quarterly that America's demand for new and replacement RN's will grow by 29 percent between 2004 and 2014, to 1.2 million, in order to accommodate growing patient needs and to replace retiring nurses. Yet the Republican budget funds nursing workforce development programs at last year's level of $150 million. Congress must do more to address this crisis.

I am proud to cosponsor this amendment and I urge my colleagues to vote for it. These additional funds are crucial for so many important programs that change lives and save lives. I will keep fighting so that these programs get the funds they need and to ensure that Americans have health care at any age, public schools we can depend on, and access to higher education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Who yields time in opposition?

Mr. GREGG. I yield back the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 3048. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

This will be a 10-minute vote.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 73, nays 27, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 58 Leg.]

YEAS—73

Akaka	Bayh	Bingaman
Alexander	Bennett	Boxer
Baucus	Biden	Burns
Byrd	Hatch	Obama
Cantwell	Hutchison	Pryor
Carper	Inouye	Reed
Chafee	Jeffords	Reid
Clinton	Johnson	Roberts
Cochran	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Coleman	Kerry	Salazar
Collins	Kohl	Santorum
Conrad	Landrieu	Sarbanes
Dayton	Lautenberg	Schumer
DeWine	Leahy	Smith
Dodd	Levin	Snowe
Dole	Lieberman	Specter
Domenici	Lincoln	Stabenow
Dorgan	Lott	Stevens
Durbin	Lugar	Talent
Feingold	Menendez	Thune
Feinstein	Mikulski	Voinovich
Frist	Murkowski	Warner
Grassley	Murray	Wyden
Hagel	Nelson (FL)	
Harkin	Nelson (NE)	

NAYS—27

Allard	Craig	Kyl
Allen	Crapo	Martinez
Bond	DeMint	McCain
Brownback	Ensign	McConnell
Bunning	Enzi	Sessions
Burr	Graham	Shelby
Chambliss	Gregg	Sununu
Coburn	Inhofe	Thomas
Cornyn	Isakson	Vitter

The amendment (No. 3048) was agreed to.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I spoke to the distinguished majority leader just a few minutes ago, and we have lots and lots of amendments. We hope we would stick to 10 minutes. On my side, if Senators aren't here in 10 minutes, I hope it would be a fair, equal punishment that if people aren't here in 10 minutes, the vote should be closed. Everyone knows what the rules are. People have things to do. It is not fair to the Senators. People come straggling in after 16, 17, 18 minutes, and it is not fair. So I would hope that we have 10-minute votes. We have lots of votes to do.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I also wish to agree with the Democratic leader and express a request. We are going to have a long day here. We have a lot of votes lined up, and we have a lot of votes to follow that as well. So let's follow the managers' lead, and we are going to leave it to their discretion. Right now, we have instructed them to cut off those votes. With that, no complaints. People have to stick close to the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 3034

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUNUNU). Under the previous order, the next amendment is the Lieberman amendment No. 3034 on which the yeas and nays have been ordered and for which there will be 2 minutes evenly divided for debate.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, could I just alert colleagues, we have now done a vote count. We have over 60 votes pending. We can only do three votes an hour. That would take us 20 hours. I urge colleagues—there are other vehicles coming. We have had a lot of votes already on this budget resolution. We have a lot more votes scheduled. I would urge colleagues to come to us and remove some of their amendments from consideration.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On amendment No. 3034, the Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator DURBIN be added as a cosponsor of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I have said that the budget before us, when it comes to our homeland security, is shortsighted and short-funded. But I wish to go beyond that, so working with my staff we reached out to experts in the various areas that constitute our homeland security in a time of terrorism. This is the result: a comprehensive proposal that would add $8 billion to our homeland security. It is, in fact, what is necessary to protect the American people at a time of terrorism and from natural disasters like Katrina. The money will go to first responders, port security, rail transit security, FEMA, bioterrorism, chemical security, and aviation security, and the Coast Guard.

For real homeland security, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Who yields time in opposition? The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, we have increased the funding for national defense by $30 billion in this bill in the core budget. We have increased it by $40 billion in the ancillary budget which funds alongside the core budget, putting it up to $90 billion. We have increased border and port security funding by $4 billion, and we already have in the pipeline something like $5 billion of unspent money for first responders and something like $3.5 billion for interoperability. This amendment is not needed, and it is a tax-and-spend amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 3034.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senators were necessarily absent: the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ALLEN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 59 Leg.]

YEAS—43

Akaka	Carper	Feingold
Bayh	Clinton	Feinstein
Biden	Conrad	Harkin
Bingaman	Dayton	Inouye
Boxer	Dodd	Jeffords
Byrd	Dorgan	Johnson
Cantwell	Durbin	Kennedy
Kerry	Menendez	Rockefeller
Kohl	Mikulski	Salazar
Landrieu	Murray	Sarbanes
Lautenberg	Nelson (FL)	Schumer
Leahy	Obama	Stabenow
Levin	Pryor	Wyden
Lieberman	Reed	
Lincoln	Reid	

NAYS—53

Alexander	Dole	Murkowski
Allard	Domenici	Nelson (NE)
Bennett	Ensign	Roberts
Bond	Enzi	Santorum
Brownback	Frist	Sessions
Bunning	Graham	Shelby
Burns	Grassley	Smith
Burr	Gregg	Snowe
Chambliss	Hagel	Specter
Coburn	Hatch	Stevens
Cochran	Hutchison	Sununu
Coleman	Inhofe	Talent
Collins	Isakson	Thomas
Cornyn	Kyl	Thune
Craig	Lugar	Vitter
Crapo	Martinez	Voinovich
DeMint	McCain	Warner
DeWine	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—4

Allen	Chafee
Baucus	Lott

The amendment (No. 3034) was rejected.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3137

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the next amendment is the Lautenberg amendment on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. There will be 2 minutes evenly divided. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, my amendment is now being considered. The vote is simple: If you vote yes, you support my amendment to strike this unfair tax increase from the budget. However, if you vote no on this, you are saying to the average family that they should pay more taxes. So the vote is yes. We want to strike this unfair tax increase from the budget.

The average family of four traveling round-trip on nonstop flights will pay $40 in security taxes under the President's budget proposal. The traveling public is already overtaxed. They pay nearly 20 percent in total Federal taxes on every airline ticket.

To make matters worse, this tax increase will hit families the hardest—families and loved ones traveling to be together, whether during holidays or emergencies.

The proper vote for the families of America is a yes vote. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and eliminate the Bush airline passenger tax increase.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. Who seeks time in opposition?

Mr. GREGG. We are willing to accept this amendment. I ask unanimous consent the yeas and nays be vitiated and the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the yeas and nays are vitiated and the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3137) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3103

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the next amendment is No. 3103, the Sarbanes amendment, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered and on which there will be 2 minutes evenly divided.

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, this amendment raises the function 300 back to baseline. I have a letter here. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD. It is from a number of the leading environmental organizations.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 16, 2006.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of our millions of members and supporters, we write to urge you to vote for the amendment to the budget resolution proposed by Senator Sarbanes. It will provide $31.1 billion for environmental protection and restoration in function 300 of the Fiscal Year 2007 budget. This amendment will restore funding in function 300 to the baseline level taken from Fiscal Year 2006 and stop the proposed back slide in environmental protection. The environment is not only important for public health, but it is also a critical asset to the nation providing recreational, cultural, economic, and ecological capital to our society.

The cuts proposed in the Senate budget resolution would undermine the progress that has been made on protecting our natural resources. Funding for drinking water and clean water infrastructure has been cut to dangerous levels; clean up of toxic sites around the country will continue to slow down; species and land preservation for future generations will struggle forward; the condition of our national parks would continue to deteriorate; our ocean resources would linger on the brink of collapse; and farmers and ranchers seeking assistance to improve environmental quality will be turned away.

Unfortunately, the federal government in the past several years has not provided the support that these resources need to protect local communities and the natural ecosystems. In addition, past budget resolutions have proposed Arctic drilling—an old, tired idea that would further devastate the environment—as a way to pay for other important programs. Though on paper there have been increases in funding for the environment, inflation has outstripped those increases leading to cut backs in critical environmental programs. Adjusted for inflation the cuts have amounted to almost $2 billion in the past two years. We ask that you stop this trend and reinvigorate the federal government's role as a leader in investing in our country by providing at least $31.1 billion for environmental protection and restoration in the Fiscal Year 2007 budget.

Sincerely,

Cindy Shogan, Executive Director, Alaska Wilderness League; S. Elizabeth Birnbaum, Vice President for Government Affairs, American Rivers; Mary Beth Beetham, Director of Legislative Affairs, Defenders of Wildlife; Marty Hayden, Vice President for Policy and Legislation, Earthjustice; Brock Evans, President, Endangered Species Coalition; Sara Zdeb, Legislative Director, Friends of the Earth; Betsy Loyless, Vice President for Policy, National Audubon Society; Karen Steuer,

Vice President, National Environmental Trust; Blake Selzer, Legislative Director, National Parks Conservation Association; Heather Taylor, Deputy Legislative Director, Natural Resources Defense Council; Michele Boyd, Legislative Director, Public Citizen; Anna Aurilio, Legislative Director, U.S. PIRG; Linda Lance, Vice President Public Policy, The Wilderness Society.

Mr. SARBANES. I will quote one paragraph:

The cuts proposed in the Senate budget resolution would undermine the progress that has been made on protecting our natural resources. Funding for drinking water and clean water infrastructure has been cut to dangerous levels; clean up of toxic sites around the country will continue to slow down; species and land preservation for future generations will struggle forward; the condition of our national parks would continue to deteriorate; our ocean resources would linger on the brink of collapse; and farmers and ranchers seeking assistance to improve environmental quality will be turned away.

Don't let these things happen. Support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, let me say to my friend Senator SARBANES, there is no stronger supporter of our State revolving funds than I am, as chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee. But I wish to say this is a $2.9 billion tax increase. There are ways of doing it by eliminating some unnecessary programs.

Regarding the portion also affecting the Corps of Engineers, I understand they are underfunded at this time and we are working right now in our committee to see what we can do to come up with some money by striking some of the less important, less necessary programs.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Sarbanes amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded, the question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered. Under the previous order, this will be again a 10-minute vote.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senator was necessarily absent: the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 60 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Akaka	Byrd	Conrad
Baucus	Cantwell	Dayton
Bayh	Carper	DeWine
Biden	Chafee	Dodd
Bingaman	Clinton	Dorgan
Boxer	Collins	Durbin
Feingold	Leahy	Reed
Feinstein	Lieberman	Reid
Harkin	Lincoln	Rockefeller
Inouye	Menendez	Salazar
Jeffords	Mikulski	Sarbanes
Johnson	Murray	Schumer
Kennedy	Nelson (FL)	Snowe
Kerry	Nelson (NE)	Stabenow
Kohl	Obama	Warner
Lautenberg	Pryor	Wyden

NAYS—49

Alexander	Domenici	McConnell
Allard	Ensign	Murkowski
Allen	Enzi	Roberts
Bennett	Frist	Santorum
Bond	Graham	Sessions
Brownback	Grassley	Shelby
Bunning	Gregg	Smith
Burns	Hagel	Specter
Burr	Hatch	Stevens
Chambliss	Hutchison	Sununu
Coburn	Inhofe	Talent
Cochran	Isakson	Thomas
Coleman	Kyl	Thune
Cornyn	Lott	Vitter
Crapo	Lugar	Voinovich
DeMint	Martinez	
Dole	McCain	

NOT VOTING—3

Craig	Landrieu	Levin

The amendment (No. 3103) was rejected.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3102

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the next amendment is the Dorgan amendment No. 3102. The yeas and nays have been ordered. There will be 2 minutes equally divided.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, can I alert colleagues again? We have colleagues who are missing votes. They are missing votes because of the time deadline. We have had Democrats missing votes and we have had Republicans missing votes. We don't want you to miss votes. We want you to make votes but at the same time we have to stay on schedule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I will be very brief.

This is an amendment which I offered last year. It adds $1 billion to the account dealing with American Indians.

All of us in this Chamber know there are neighbors among us in this country who live in Third World communities. We have a bona fide Federal crisis in health care, education, and housing on Indian reservations. We have a trust responsibility for the health care of American Indians.

Did you know we also have a responsibility for Federal prisoners' health care? We spend twice as much per person for the health care of Federal prisoners as we do to meet our trust responsibility for the health care of American Indians.

We all know we underfund these accounts. This adds $1 billion to a multitude of Indian accounts dealing with health care, housing, and education. It is funded by closing some tax loopholes.

I hope this Senate will decide this is the right set of priorities.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, this amendment doesn't guarantee that any money goes to the tribal authorities. All it does is raise the cap by $1 billion—increases taxes by $1 billion. It is entirely up to the Appropriations Committee how they spend money. We have no control over that. The practical effect of this amendment is simply tax and spend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. Under the previous order, the yeas and nays have been ordered. Under the previous order, this will be a 10-minute vote.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 56, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 61 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Akaka	Feinstein	Mikulski
Baucus	Harkin	Murray
Bayh	Jeffords	Nelson (FL)
Biden	Johnson	Nelson (NE)
Bingaman	Kennedy	Obama
Boxer	Kerry	Pryor
Byrd	Kohl	Reed
Cantwell	Landrieu	Reid
Clinton	Lautenberg	Rockefeller
Conrad	Leahy	Salazar
Dodd	Levin	Sarbanes
Dorgan	Lieberman	Schumer
Durbin	Lincoln	Stabenow
Feingold	Menendez	Wyden

NAYS—56

Alexander	DeMint	McCain
Allard	DeWine	McConnell
Allen	Dole	Murkowski
Bennett	Domenici	Roberts
Bond	Ensign	Santorum
Brownback	Enzi	Sessions
Bunning	Frist	Shelby
Burns	Graham	Smith
Burr	Grassley	Snowe
Carper	Gregg	Specter
Chafee	Hagel	Stevens
Chambliss	Hatch	Sununu
Coburn	Hutchison	Talent
Cochran	Inhofe	Thomas
Coleman	Isakson	Thune
Collins	Kyl	Vitter
Cornyn	Lott	Voinovich
Craig	Lugar	Warner
Crapo	Martinez	

NOT VOTING—2

Dayton	Inouye

The amendment (No. 3102) was rejected.

Mr. GREGG. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. REID. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3100

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to voting on the Cornyn amendment.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, my amendment directs the Senate Committee on Finance to find $10 billion in additional savings out of the Medicare Program and builds on the work done in the Deficit Reduction Act where we

reduced the rate of growth for mandatory spending by nearly $100 billion over the next decade.

As all Members know, there is increasing pressure on discretionary spending on important priorities because of the growth of Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid. Medicare and Medicaid alone grew by 22 percent over the last 5 years. This will allow the Committee on Finance to take the stabilization fund, for example, that is used to supplement payments to preferred provider organizations which participate in the Medicare Program, which is available to be recouped to help pay down some of the debt in the amount of $10 billion, as well as other sources of revenue that they can gain out of the Medicare Program.

I ask my colleagues to vote ''aye.''

Mr. CONRAD. I yield the time to the ranking member on the Finance Committee, Senator BAUCUS.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, colleagues, this is déjà vu all over again. This is the reconciliation cut bill of $11 billion which barely passed the House all over again. It is added on, on top of that again. That was a net $11 billion cut for Medicare and Medicaid in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Finance, and this is $11 billion yet on top of that. That will come out of you know whose hides. You know how unpopular that will be back home.

This is not the way to cut entitlement spending or put a limit on it. The better way is an all-encompassing way when everyone is in it together, not directed to the Committee on Finance jurisdiction which will cut more out of Medicaid, cut more spending out of Medicare.

I strongly urge my colleagues, just remember, this is déjà vu all over again. It is a repeat of what happened last year. That was extremely unpopular.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant journal clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 57, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 62 Leg.]

YEAS—43

Alexander	DeMint	McCain
Allard	Dole	McConnell
Allen	Domenici	Nelson (NE)
Bennett	Ensign	Roberts
Bond	Enzi	Santorum
Brownback	Frist	Sessions
Bunning	Graham	Shelby
Burns	Grassley	Sununu
Burr	Gregg	Talent
Chambliss	Hagel	Thune
Coburn	Hatch	Vitter
Cochran	Inhofe	Voinovich
Cornyn	Isakson	Warner
Craig	Kyl	
Crapo	Lott	

NAYS—57

Akaka	Bingaman	Carper
Baucus	Boxer	Chafee
Bayh	Byrd	Clinton
Biden	Cantwell	Coleman
Collins	Kerry	Obama
Conrad	Kohl	Pryor
Dayton	Landrieu	Reed
DeWine	Lautenberg	Reid
Dodd	Leahy	Rockefeller
Dorgan	Levin	Salazar
Durbin	Lieberman	Sarbanes
Feingold	Lincoln	Schumer
Feinstein	Lugar	Smith
Harkin	Martinez	Snowe
Hutchison	Menendez	Specter
Inouye	Mikulski	Stabenow
Jeffords	Murkowski	Stevens
Johnson	Murray	Thomas
Kennedy	Nelson (FL)	Wyden

The amendment (No. 3100) was rejected.

Mr. GREGG. I move to reconsider the vote and move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on vote No. 62, I am recorded as ''yea.'' I intended to vote ''nay.'' I ask unanimous consent to change my vote. It will not change the outcome of the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

AMENDMENT NO. 3112 WITHDRAWN

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, with the approval of Senator LANDRIEU, I ask unanimous consent that her amendment No. 3112 be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, for the edification of our colleagues, when we complete the Collins amendment, the next five amendments after that—we have pending the Stabenow, Akaka, and Collins amendments—and the next five amendments after that will be the Lincoln amendment No. 3047; Grassley, an unnumbered amendment; Inhofe, No. 3093, I believe; Lincoln, No. 3106; Kerry, No. 3143.

We are now on to Senator STABENOW.

AMENDMENT NO. 3141

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 2 minutes equally divided on the amendment.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, my amendment is about guaranteeing that every veteran in America has the health care they were promised and they deserve. Over the last 2 years, we have seen a 500-percent increase in the number of veterans seeking care from the VA who served in Iraq and Afghanistan alone. But this budget falls over 35,000 veterans short of the number of Iraq and Afghanistan veterans whom the VA currently treats. And remarkably, the President's budget projects fewer vets will seek mental health care, which is absolutely incorrect. If you believe, as I do, the men and women who have fought for our country should not have to fight every day, every year, for the health care they need, I urge you to vote yes on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I will be brief, but it is important I have the attention of my colleagues.

Yesterday, with the Burns amendment, we increased veterans funding over last year by 14 percent, so we have already increased veterans spending by 14 percent. The Senator from Michigan wishes now to increase it by 36 percent. That is 104 billion new dollars over a 5-year period. And it is taxed for. At least she has the courtesy of offering something that is paid for.

But even the Veterans Administration, with the Burns amendment, by their best guesstimation—and I use the word ''guesstimation''—would suggest that veterans' care next year will grow by less than 2 percent. There is absolutely no justification for increasing veterans health care budgets by a grand total of 36 percent in 1 year.

This Senate has been progressively generous to America's veterans, as we should be. It is now one of the most rapidly growing health care budgets in our country, with the Burns amendment, not the Stabenow amendment. Please vote no on the Stabenow amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 63 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Akaka	Feinstein	Murray
Baucus	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Bayh	Inouye	Obama
Biden	Jeffords	Pryor
Bingaman	Johnson	Reed
Boxer	Kennedy	Reid
Byrd	Kerry	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Kohl	Salazar
Carper	Landrieu	Sarbanes
Clinton	Lautenberg	Schumer
Conrad	Leahy	Snowe
Dayton	Levin	Specter
Dodd	Lieberman	Stabenow
Dorgan	Lincoln	Wyden
Durbin	Menendez	
Feingold	Mikulski	

NAYS—54

Alexander	DeMint	Martinez
Allard	DeWine	McCain
Allen	Dole	McConnell
Bennett	Domenici	Murkowski
Bond	Ensign	Nelson (NE)
Brownback	Enzi	Roberts
Bunning	Frist	Santorum
Burns	Graham	Sessions
Burr	Grassley	Shelby
Chafee	Gregg	Smith
Chambliss	Hagel	Stevens
Coburn	Hatch	Sununu
Cochran	Hutchison	Talent
Coleman	Inhofe	Thomas
Collins	Isakson	Thune
Cornyn	Kyl	Vitter
Craig	Lott	Voinovich
Crapo	Lugar	Warner

The amendment (No. 3141) was rejected.

Mr. GREGG. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. FRIST. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to change my vote on amendment No. 3141, which we just voted on prior to this, offered by Senator STABENOW. I voted ''nay.'' I wish to change it to ''yea.'' It doesn't change the outcome of the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

AMENDMENT NO. 3071

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote on the Akaka amendment.

Who yields time?

Mr. CONRAD. I yield time to the Senator.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators Boxer and Johnson be added as cosponsors of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, this amendment restores $3 billion to title I in No Child Left Behind educational programs. The amendment was offered because this budget resolution underfunds title I by more than $12 billion. You should know that a $3 billion increase would bring title I up to what the President requested since fiscal year 2004. Without this increase, 29 States could lose title I funding, and another 7 States would be level funded.

Vote aye on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, this amendment increases funding by $3 billion and will be offset by closing tax loopholes, which means raising taxes, which would require a separate effort, anyway. The resolution we have before us already provides $12.7 billion in 2007 for grants to local education agencies, the largest component of No Child Left Behind. That represents a 45-percent increase from 2001.

The Federal investment in education will have grown by $12.2 billion, or 29 percent, since fiscal year 2001. In addition, the resolution provides an additional $1.5 billion for funding for function 500, which includes No Child Left Behind, and those funds can be used for that. Education is and should be one of our highest priorities, but this amendment is paid for by increasing taxes and busts the discretionary spending cap. I ask that you vote no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant journal clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 64 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Akaka	Durbin	Mikulski
Baucus	Feingold	Murray
Bayh	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Biden	Harkin	Nelson (NE)
Bingaman	Inouye	Obama
Boxer	Jeffords	Pryor
Byrd	Johnson	Reed
Cantwell	Kennedy	Reid
Carper	Kerry	Rockefeller
Chafee	Kohl	Salazar
Clinton	Landrieu	Sarbanes
Collins	Lautenberg	Schumer
Conrad	Leahy	Snowe
Dayton	Levin	Stabenow
DeWine	Lieberman	Wyden
Dodd	Lincoln	
Dorgan	Menendez	

NAYS—51

Alexander	Dole	McCain
Allard	Domenici	McConnell
Allen	Ensign	Murkowski
Bennett	Enzi	Roberts
Bond	Frist	Santorum
Brownback	Graham	Sessions
Bunning	Grassley	Shelby
Burns	Gregg	Smith
Burr	Hagel	Specter
Chambliss	Hatch	Stevens
Coburn	Hutchison	Sununu
Cochran	Inhofe	Talent
Coleman	Isakson	Thomas
Cornyn	Kyl	Thune
Craig	Lott	Vitter
Crapo	Lugar	Voinovich
DeMint	Martinez	Warner

The amendment (No. 3071) was rejected.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BOND. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, we are waiting for Senator CONRAD. For the moment, we will have to skip over Senator COLLINS. I understand we are hopefully going to have an understanding relative to the next two amendments, which will be the Grassley and Lincoln amendments.

That brings us to Senator INHOFE. We will come back to Senators COLLINS, GRASSLEY, and LINCOLN after this Inhofe vote.

AMENDMENT NO. 3093

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAFEE). The clerk will report the Inhofe amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] proposes an amendment numbered 3093.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. . TO CONTROL DISCRETIONARY SPENDING

''Beginning with fiscal year 2007 and thereafter, all non-defense, non-trust-fund, discretionary spending shall not exceed the previous fiscal year's levels, for purposes of the congressional budget process (Section 302 et al of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974), without a 2/3 vote of Members duly chosen and sworn.''

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, how much time is divided on this amendment? I didn't get that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 1 minute for each side.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, this is kind of a litmus test amendment. We have had it up a couple times before. We do intend to pick up votes each time. It is an amendment to get into some of the big spending we do around here. With the exception of trust votes and national defense, it says that any vote on appropriations that exceeds the previous year has to have a two-thirds majority.

This amendment is endorsed by a number of groups, including the American Conservative Union, Christian Coalition, and other groups. It will be a scored vote. It is a very significant vote. I think it is really the only meaningful vote to do something about curbing spending that we will have the entire day.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, this is truly a sweeping amendment. I hope colleagues are listening. This amendment seeks to lock in the current level of discretionary spending, not just for this year but permanently. I hope colleagues are listening. This seeks to lock in the current level of spending for homeland security, for veterans health, for NIH, not just for 1 year but permanently because it would take 67 votes to increase it.

I hope my colleagues will reject this amendment. This is an amendment which goes against every democratic impulse of this body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the five amendments we have put in order, the yeas and nays be deemed to have been granted, along with the seconds of those yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to that being in order? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 3093. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senators were necessarily absent: the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT), and the Senator from Arkansas (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 62, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 65 Leg.]

YEAS—35

Allard	Chambliss	Dole
Allen	Coburn	Ensign
Brownback	Cornyn	Enzi
Bunning	Craig	Frist
Burns	Crapo	Graham
Burr	DeMint	Grassley

Gregg	Kyl	Sessions
Hagel	Martinez	Sununu
Hatch	McCain	Thomas
Hutchison	McConnell	Thune
Inhofe	Nelson (NE)	Vitter
Isakson	Santorum	

NAYS—62

Akaka	Dorgan	Nelson (FL)
Alexander	Durbin	Obama
Baucus	Feingold	Pryor
Bayh	Feinstein	Reed
Bennett	Harkin	Reid
Biden	Inouye	Roberts
Bingaman	Jeffords	Rockefeller
Bond	Johnson	Salazar
Boxer	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Byrd	Kerry	Schumer
Cantwell	Kohl	Shelby
Carper	Landrieu	Smith
Chafee	Lautenberg	Snowe
Clinton	Leahy	Specter
Cochran	Levin	Stabenow
Coleman	Lieberman	Stevens
Collins	Lincoln	Talent
Conrad	Lugar	Voinovich
Dayton	Menendez	Warner
DeWine	Mikulski	Wyden
Dodd	Murray	

NOT VOTING—3

Domenici	Lott	Murkowski

The amendment (No. 3093) was rejected.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3064

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be vitiated on the Collins amendment No. 3064, and I ask unanimous consent that it be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3064) was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3148, 3127, AND 3047 WITHDRAWN

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I am prepared to withdraw my amendment No. 3148 and Senator HAGEL is also prepared to have his amendment No. 3127 withdrawn. We are also prepared to withdraw Lincoln amendment No. 3047. We have managed to work out an understanding on all of these matters, so I ask unanimous consent to have those amendments withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, it is also our understanding that Senator GRASSLEY would not offer his amendment that was the matching amendment to the Lincoln amendment that has now been withdrawn.

Mr. GREGG. Under the previous agreement, Mr. President, we are now going to turn to the Lincoln amendment No. 3106, followed by the Kerry amendment No. 4103, followed by the DeMint amendment No. 3087.

AMENDMENT NO. 3106

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, in this administration's budget, time and time again rural America has been asked to give disproportionately, whether it is to deficit reduction, the war in Iraq, or anything else. Quite frankly, I think it is important for us to look seriously at the priorities of this budget but, more importantly, to look at rural America and what it means to the fabric of this country.

There are cuts in this budget to supplemental nutrition programs for women, infants, and children. USDA's rural housing program is cut by $259 million, resource conservation and development council, world business enterprise grant, telemedicine, State and private forestry programs, cooperative agriculture and food safety research units—all of these issues are critical to rural America. They don't have the corporate tax base or corporate citizenry out there that is going to support them.

If we want the way of life in this country to be maintained with both the fabric of this country being built by our urban areas and our rural areas, it is essential that we support the people and the working families in those areas.

I ask my colleagues to look at conservation, WIC, all of these programs and how important they are in your State.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I regrettably rise in opposition to this amendment. The Senator from Arkansas and I normally agree on every issue involving agriculture. Philosophically, I am with her. But the problem is it raises the cap a little over $2 billion. It is simply not paid for. The things she is seeking to add money for such as research, nutrition, various rural development programs, all are great programs, but the time to handle that is in the appropriations process, not in the budget process. This means we would either have to raise taxes or increase the deficit, and now is not the time to have that debate. I think it should be in the appropriations process. I urge a ''no'' vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 3106.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 66 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Akaka	Durbin	Menendez
Baucus	Feingold	Mikulski
Bayh	Feinstein	Murray
Biden	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Inouye	Nelson (NE)
Boxer	Jeffords	Obama
Burns	Johnson	Pryor
Byrd	Kennedy	Reed
Cantwell	Kerry	Reid
Carper	Kohl	Rockefeller
Clinton	Landrieu	Salazar
Collins	Lautenberg	Sarbanes
Conrad	Leahy	Schumer
Dayton	Levin	Snowe
Dodd	Lieberman	Stabenow
Dorgan	Lincoln	Wyden

NAYS—52

Alexander	Dole	McConnell
Allard	Domenici	Murkowski
Allen	Ensign	Roberts
Bennett	Enzi	Santorum
Bond	Frist	Sessions
Brownback	Graham	Shelby
Bunning	Grassley	Smith
Burr	Gregg	Specter
Chafee	Hagel	Stevens
Chambliss	Hatch	Sununu
Coburn	Hutchison	Talent
Cochran	Inhofe	Thomas
Coleman	Isakson	Thune
Cornyn	Kyl	Vitter
Craig	Lott	Voinovich
Crapo	Lugar	Warner
DeMint	Martinez	
DeWine	McCain	

The amendment (No. 3106) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

AMENDMENT NO. 3143, AS MODIFIED

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent my modification be accepted at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

(Purpose: To prevent the imposition of excessive TRICARE fees and co-pays on military retirees)

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $592,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $1,619,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $2,188,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $2,685,000,000.

On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $3,271,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $592,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $1,619,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $2,188,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $2,685,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $3,271,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by $ 735,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $1,862,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $2,322,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $2,816,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $3,424,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $592,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $1,619,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $2,188,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $2,685,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $3,271,000,000.

On page 9, line 20, increase the amount by $735,000,000.

On page 9, line 21, increase the amount by $592,000,000.

On page 9, line 24, increase the amount by $1,862,000,000.

On page 9, line 25, increase the amount by $1,619,000,000.

On page 10, line 3, increase the amount by $2,322,000,000.

On page 10, line 4, increase the amount by $2,188,000,000.

On page 10, line 7, increase the amount by $2,816,000,000.

On page 10, line 8, increase the amount by $2,685,000,000.

On page 10, line 11, increase the amount by $3,424,000,000.

On page 10, line 12, increase the amount by $3,271,000,000.

On page 53, line 1, increase the amount by $735,000,000.

On page 53, line 2, increase the amount by $592,000,000.

On page 53, line 4, increase the amount by $1,862,000,000.

On page 53, line 7, increase the amount by $2,322,000,000.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, the Bush budget triples the fees for officers who are retired under the age of 65 who put in their 20 years of service, and doubles the fees and copays for senior enlisted folks, again, after their 20 years of service to the country.

There are several other ways to cover the costs of increased health care under TRICARE. We could stimulate the use of lower cost mail-order pharmacies. We could negotiate with drug manufacturers who secure discounts under TRICARE, which we don't do. You don't have to take it out of the hide of the retirees themselves.

We pay for this. It is paid for by closing a number of tax loopholes and it is fully paid for so we do not have to raise copays on retirees who put in 20 years of service in uniform.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for highlighting an issue that is important to the Armed Services Committee, the authorizing committee. A lot of work is already going on to deal with this problem. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Peter Pace, said rising health care costs are the No. 1 issue when he spoke to our committee.

This amendment would cost $10.4 billion over 5 years and result in an increase in taxes by that amount. The authorizing committee does need to focus on it and is focusing on this issue.

I ask the amendment be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senator was necessarily absent: the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 53, as follows:

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 67 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Akaka	Byrd	DeWine
Baucus	Cantwell	Dodd
Bayh	Chafee	Dorgan
Biden	Clinton	Durbin
Bingaman	Conrad	Feingold
Boxer	Dayton	Feinstein
Harkin	Levin	Reed
Inouye	Lieberman	Reid
Jeffords	Lincoln	Rockefeller
Johnson	Menendez	Salazar
Kennedy	Mikulski	Sarbanes
Kerry	Murray	Schumer
Kohl	Nelson (FL)	Stabenow
Landrieu	Nelson (NE)	Wyden
Lautenberg	Obama	
Leahy	Pryor	

NAYS—53

Alexander	Dole	McConnell
Allard	Domenici	Murkowski
Allen	Ensign	Roberts
Bennett	Enzi	Santorum
Bond	Frist	Sessions
Brownback	Graham	Shelby
Bunning	Grassley	Smith
Burr	Gregg	Snowe
Carper	Hagel	Specter
Chambliss	Hatch	Stevens
Coburn	Hutchison	Sununu
Cochran	Inhofe	Talent
Coleman	Isakson	Thomas
Collins	Kyl	Thune
Cornyn	Lott	Vitter
Craig	Lugar	Voinovich
Crapo	Martinez	Warner
DeMint	McCain	

NOT VOTING—1

Burns

The amendment (No. 3143), as modified, was rejected.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, we have made significant progress in reducing the number of amendments. This is the good news—really dramatic progress. The bad news is, with the amendments that are still pending we will be here until 2 o'clock in the morning.

It is in the hands of Members of this body. If everybody sticks to their guns and insists on their amendments, we are going to be here until 2 o'clock in the morning.

I ask colleagues to please show some forbearance. We have other vehicles that are coming—the appropriations bills—and other opportunities to make Members' views known.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I appreciate the especially hard work of the Senator from North Dakota in reducing the number of amendments. I just wish we had been a little more successful because we will be here until 2 o'clock in the morning at the rate we are going.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3144, 3085, 3140, 3139, 3053, 3079, 3083, 3033; 3052, AS MODIFIED, 3154, AND 3059, EN BLOC

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, in an effort to try to move things along, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table:

Senator OBAMA's amendment No. 3144; Senator ENSIGN, amendment No. 3085; Senator LEVIN, amendment No. 3140; Senator LANDRIEU, amendment No. 3139; Senator LINCOLN, amendment No. 3053; Senator DEWINE, amendment No. 3079; Senator DEWINE, amendment No. 3083; Senator DEWINE, amendment No. 3033; Senator SANTORUM, amendment No. 3052, as modified; Senator LEAHY, amendment No. 3154; and Senator BAUCUS, amendment No. 3059.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, we don't have on our list the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I am told that is OK. That has been cleared on both sides.

Mr. COBURN. I object.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I renew my unanimous consent request reflecting all those amendments which have been read except for amendment No. 3052 of Mr. SANTORUM.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Objection, the amendments are agreed to.

The amendments were agreed to as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3144

(Purpose: To provide a $40 million increase in FY 2007 for the Homeless Veterans Reintegration Program and to improve job services for hard-to-place veterans)

On page 23, line 24, increase the amount by $40,000,000.

On page 23, line 25, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 24, line 4, increase the amount by $25,000,000.

On page 24, line 8, increase the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 24, line 12, increase the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 24, line 16, increase the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 27, line 23, decrease the amount by $40,000,000.

On page 27, line 24, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 28, line 2, decrease the amount by $25,000,000.

On page 28, line 5, decrease the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 28, line 8, decrease the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 28, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3085

(Purpose: To provide funding to hire an additional 500 Border Patrol Agents; fully funding the promise Congress made to the American people to hire 2,000 new agents in FY2007 as authorized by the National Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 and as recommended by the 9/11 Commission)

On page 24, line 24, increase the amount by $153,000,000.

On page 24, line 25, increase the amount by $122,400,000.

On page 25, line 4, increase the amount by $15,300,000.

On page 25, line 8, increase the amount by $15,300,000.

On page 10, line 20, decrease the amount by $153,000,000.

On page 10, line 21, decrease the amount by $122,400,000.

On page 10, line 25, decrease the amount by $15,300,000.

On page 11, line 4, decrease the amount by $15,300,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3140

(Purpose: To provide funds to establish additional Northern Border Air Wings, offset through reductions in Function 920)

On page 24, line 24, increase the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 24, line 25, increase the amount by $4,000,000.

On page 25, line 4, increase the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 27, line 23, decrease the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 27, line 24, decrease the amount by $4,000,000.

On page 28, line 2, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3139

(Purpose: To provide funding for maintaining a robust long range bomber force including 94 B–52 aircraft)

On page 9, line 20, increase the amount by $77,000,000.

On page 9, line 21, increase the amount by $43,000,000.

On page 9, line 24, increase the amount by $239,000,000.

On page 9, line 25, increase the amount by $188,000,000.

On page 10, line 3, increase the amount by $270,000,000.

On page 10, line 4, increase the amount by $238,000,000.

On page 10, line 7, increase the amount by $217,000,000.

On page 10, line 8, increase the amount by $240,000,000.

On page 10, line 11, increase the amount by $263,000,000.

On page 10, line 12, increase the amount by $246,000,000.

On page 10, line 20, decrease the amount by $77,000,000.

On page 10, line 21, decrease the amount by $43,000,000.

On page 10, line 24, decrease the amount by $239,000,000.

On page 10, line 25, decrease the amount by $188,000,000.

On page 11, line 3, decrease the amount by $270,000,000.

On page 11, line 4, decrease the amount by $238,000,000.

On page 11, line 7, decrease the amount by $217,000,000.

On page 11, line 8, decrease the amount by $240,000,000.

On page 11, line 11, decrease the amount by $263,000,000.

On page 11, line 12, decrease the amount by $246,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3053

(Purpose: To provide for restoring funding for the portion of the COPS program devoted to countering methamphetamine, offset by a reduction to Function 920 (Allowances)

On page 24, line 24, increase the amount by $23,000,000.

On page 24, line 25, increase the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 25, line 3, increase the amount by $23,000,000.

On page 25, line 4, increase the amount by $9,000,000.

On page 25, line 7, increase the amount by $23,000,000.

On page 25, line 8, increase the amount by $15,000,000.

On page 25, line 11, increase the amount by $23,000,000.

On page 25, line 12, increase the amount by $20,000,000.

On page 25, line 15, increase the amount by $23,000,000.

On page 25, line 16, increase the amount by $23,000,000.

On page 27, line 23, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.

On page 27, line 24, decrease the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 28, line 1, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.

On page 28, line 2, decrease the amount by $9,000,000.

On page 28, line 4, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.

On page 28, line 5, decrease the amount by $15,000,000.

On page 28, line 7, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.

On page 28, line 8, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.

On page 28, line 10, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.

On page 28, line 11, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3079

(Purpose: To increase funding for Child Survival and Maternal Health Programs)

On page 10, line 20, increase the amount by $77,000,000.

On page 10, line 21, increase the amount by $77,000,000.

On page 27, line 23, decrease the amount by $77,000,000.

On page 27, line 24, decrease the amount by $77,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3083

(Purpose: To increase funding for the Children's Hospitals Graduate Medical Education Program under the Public Health Service Act for fiscal year 2007)

On page 19, line 24, increase the amount by $198,000,000.

On page 19, line 25, increase the amount by $198,000,000.

On page 27, line 23, decrease the amount by $198,000,000.

On page 27, line 24, decrease the amount by $198,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3033

(Purpose: To increase funding for NASA aeronautics programs by $179,000,000 in fiscal year 2007, with an offset)

On page 11, line 21, increase the amount by $179,000,000.

On page 11, line 22, increase the amount by $179,000,000.

On page 27, line 23, decrease the amount by $179,000,000.

On page 27, line 24, decrease the amount by $179,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3154

(Purpose: To fund grants for bullet proof vests for local law enforcement agencies at the full authorized level)

On page 24, line 24, increase the amount by $41,000,000.

On page 24, line 25, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 25, line 4, increase the amount by $11,000,000.

On page 25, line 8, increase the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 25, line 12, increase the amount by $8,000,000.

On page 25, line 16, increase the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 27, line 23, decrease the amount by $41,000,000.

On page 27, line 24, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 28, line 2, decrease the amount by $11,000,000.

On page 28, line 5, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 28, line 8, decrease the amount by $8,000,000.

On page 28, line 11, decrease the amount by $6,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3059

(Purpose: To improve America's economic competitiveness)

At the end of section 309, insert the following:

(d) FINANCE.—If—

(1) the Committee on Finance of the Senate reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment is offered thereto, or if a conference report is submitted thereon, that—

(A) improves America's trade competitiveness or enforcement; or

(B) fosters health care information technology or pay-for-performance; and

(2) that committee is within its allocation as provided under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations and aggregates to the extent that such legislation would not increase the deficit for fiscal year 2007 and for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2011.

AMENDMENTS NOS 3155 AND 3156

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following two amendments which have not been filed be considered and agreed to en bloc, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table:

Senator SALAZAR on PILT, and Senator STABENOW on borders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3155

(Purpose: To fully fund the Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) program. Adds $152 million to Function 800 (General Government) for PILT)

On page 25, line 24, increase the amount by $152,000,000.

On page 25, line 25, increase the amount by $152,000,000.

On page 27, line 23, decrease the amount by $152,000,000.

On page 27, line 24, decrease the amount by $152,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3156

(Purpose: To protect the American People from terrorist attacks and threats to public health by collecting a fee for inspection exclusively of international trash shipments at the U.S. border generating $45 million in receipts. The fee will help defray the cost of increasing the number and quality of inspections of these potentially dangerous shipments at the border. The fee for inspection service will be implemented to be fully compliant with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and other applicable trade agreements)

On page 24, line 24, decrease the amount by $45,000,000.

On page 24, line 25, decrease the amount by $45,000,000.

On page 25, line 3, decrease the amount by $45,000,000.

On page 25, line 4, decrease the amount by $45,000,000.

On page 25, line 7, decrease the amount by $45,000,000.

On page 25, line 8, decrease the amount by $45,000,000.

On page 25, line 11, decrease the amount by $45,000,000.

On page 25, line 12, decrease the amount by $45,000,000.

On page 25, line 15, decrease the amount by $45,000,000.

On page 25, line 16, decrease the amount by $45,000,000.

On page 27, line 23, increase the amount by $45,000,000.

On page 27, line 24, increase the amount by $45,000,000.

On page 28, line 1, increase the amount by $45,000,000.

On page 28, line 2, increase the amount by $45,000,000.

On page 28, line 4, increase the amount by $45,000,000.

On page 28, line 5, increase the amount by $45,000,000.

On page 28, line 7, increase the amount by $45,000,000.

On page 28, line 8, increase the amount by $45,000,000.

On page 28, line 10, increase the amount by $45,000,000.

On page 28, line 11, increase the amount by $45,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3087, AS MODIFIED

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I now believe that we are on the amendment by Senator DEMINT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

AMENDMENT NO. 3087, AS MODIFIED

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I have a modified amendment that I would like to send to the desk

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DEMINT] proposes an amendment numbered 3087, as modified.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. RESERVE FUND FOR SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM.

If the Committee on Finance of the Senate reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment is offered thereto, or a conference report is submitted thereon, that provides changes to the Federal Old Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance Benefits Program established under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), by—

(1) requiring that the Federal Old Age and Survivors Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are used to finance expenditures to provide retirement and disability income of future beneficiaries of such program;

(2) ensuring that there is no change to current law scheduled benefits for individuals born before January 1, 1950;

(3) providing the option to voluntarily obtain legally binding ownership of at least some portion of each participant's benefits; and

(4) ensuring that the funds made available to finance such legislation do not exceed the amounts of the Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration's intermediate actuarial estimates of the Federal Old Age and Survivors Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, as published in the most recent report of the Board of Trustees of such Trust Funds,

the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations and aggregates to the extent that such legislation would not increase the deficit for fiscal year 2007 and for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2011.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, the amendment I have sent to the desk adds a reserve fund to the budget resolution for Social Security that would allow Congress to begin saving Social Security surpluses for future Social Security recipients.

If the Finance Committee does not report back, then nothing happens. The amendment does nothing to change Social Security—no privatization, no stock market investment, and it does not add to the deficit.

The amendment only creates a budget mechanism to allow Congress to consider ways to begin saving the Social Security surplus.

I suspect most Members of this body, Republican and Democrat, are on record on the Senate floor or in a campaign saying that it is wrong to spend the Social Security surplus on other Government programs.

While we don't yet agree on how to fix Social Security, every Member and I believe every American knows that it is wrong to continue to spend Social Security taxes on other Government programs.

This amendment would open the door to consider ways to stop spending Social Security money.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I yield the time on this side to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President my colleagues are not being fooled. This is privatization of Social Security. Turn to page 29, paragraph 3. It so provides.

We have already gone down the road on privatization of Social Security.

The so-called surplus that the Senator referred to is just to privatize Social Security.

The American public said no to privatizing Social Security. The President has realized that it is a bad idea. The Congress should realize it. It is a bad idea. The AARP sure knows it is a bad idea. I have a letter from the AARP. Let me read from it. They say:

AARP strongly opposes this attempt to resurrect a proposal that the American public has soundly rejected.

This is privatization of Social Security, pure and simple. The Senate should reject it as the American people have rejected it.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AARP

Washington, DC, March 16, 2006.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Minority Leader, Capitol Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR REID: The Senate will vote on an amendment to S. Con. Res. 83 offered by Senator DeMint to use annual Social Security surpluses to create private accounts. AARP strongly opposes this attempt to resurrect a proposal that the American public has soundly rejected.

AARP believes this proposal has serious consequences for our nation's overall fiscal health and Social Security's long-term outlook. Ostensibly designed to "stop the raid on the surplus", the proposal would still result in the Treasury Department receiving the money to spend on its needs, but the federal deficit and debt would increase by over $700 billion over the next ten years. Our nation cannot afford this unnecessary increase in its already large federal debt, and we should not ask future generations to pay for the added cost.

Social Security faces a long-term financial shortfall that we should address in a timely manner, but private accounts do nothing to address long-term solvency. AARP believes it is time to put aside polarizing ideas that do not work and get serious about securing Social Security so future generations can count on these important benefits.

Sincerely,

DAVID P. SLOANE,
Senior Managing Director, Government Relations & Advocacy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senator was necessarily absent: the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 68 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Alexander	DeWine	McCain
Allard	Dole	McConnell
Allen	Ensign	Murkowski
Bennett	Enzi	Roberts
Bond	Frist	Santorum
Brownback	Graham	Sessions
Bunning	Grassley	Shelby
Burr	Gregg	Specter
Chambliss	Hagel	Stevens
Coburn	Hatch	Sununu
Cochran	Hutchison	Thomas
Coleman	Inhofe	Thune
Cornyn	Isakson	Vitter
Craig	Kyl	Warner
Crapo	Lott	
DeMint	Martinez	

NAYS—53

Akaka	Durbin	Mikulski
Baucus	Feingold	Murray
Bayh	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Biden	Harkin	Nelson (NE)
Bingaman	Inouye	Obama
Boxer	Jeffords	Pryor
Burns	Johnson	Reed
Byrd	Kennedy	Reid
Cantwell	Kerry	Rockefeller
Carper	Kohl	Salazar
Chafee	Landrieu	Sarbanes
Clinton	Lautenberg	Schumer
Collins	Leahy	Smith
Conrad	Levin	Snowe
Dayton	Lieberman	Stabenow
Dodd	Lincoln	Talent
Domenici	Lugar	Wyden
Dorgan	Menendez	

NOT VOTING—1

Voinovich

The amendment (No. 3087), as modified, was rejected.

Mr. GREGG. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. I understand the Senator from Nebraska will offer an amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 3116 WITHDRAWN

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Mr. President, many of our colleagues would be surprised to learn, as I was, that some agencies are skimming off the top a portion of some of the congressional appropriations and keeping money in that agency without authorization.

This amendment is simple. It says if it has been determined that a constituency warrants a direct appropriation,

one that has gone through the scrutinizing process and is supported by the House, Senate, and signed into law, that constituency should receive the full amount. Bureaucrats at the agencies, who are not the fourth branch of Government, should not be unilaterally determining that some sort of surcharge should be charged against these projects. It amounts to a tax on our constituents, and it usurps the authority of Congress by circumventing the legislative process and giving nameless, faceless bureaucrats the authority to alter legislation after it has been signed into law.

We have every right to expect that what we appropriate will be 100 percent provided when we determine that is the way it is, unless we determine otherwise. And in the situation where our constituents determine that the full amount of the earmark is not needed and turns back some of the funding to the government—this amendment says that instead of going to bureaucrats in the agencies to spend as they wish—it should instead go towards deficit reduction.

I am withdrawing my amendment at this time for the sake of time. But we will all see this amendment again because I will bring it back.

Mr. GREGG. We turn to the Senator from Minnesota.

AMENDMENT NO. 3097

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I call up amendment numbered 3097 and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAYTON], for himself, Mr. DODD, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mrs. CLINTON, proposes an amendment numbered 3097.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide mandatory funding to fully fund the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B grants to states; paid for by closing corporate tax loopholes)

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $230,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $7,591,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $3,450,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $230,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $230,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $7,591,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $3,450,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $230,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by $11,501,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $230,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $7,591,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $3,450,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $230,000,000.

On page 18, line 24, increase the amount by $11,501,000,000.

On page 18, line 25, increase the amount by $230,000,000.

On page 19, line 4, increase the amount by $7,591,000,000.

On page 19, line 8, increase the amount by $3,450,000,000.

On page 19, line 12, increase the amount by $230,000,000.

Mr. DAYTON. I ask unanimous consent Senators MENENDEZ and CLINTON be added as cosponsors of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, this amendment is a unique concept. It says the Senate will fulfill a 29-year-old commitment to fund 40 percent of the costs of special education. I appreciate the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. CHAFEE, which was adopted by the Senate to bring us to 20 percent, which is half of that goal. That is an improvement.

But if we were to say the Defense Department was half funded, or national security or homeland security were half funded, we would find a reason to immediately increase that funding. So I respectfully submit that closing tax loopholes for corporations that are not paying taxes now and providing that money for special education for our students across this country is a worthy goal.

I urge adoption of the amendment. I will accept a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEMINT). The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I yield back time in opposition and ask that we proceed to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3097) was rejected.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that if the yeas and nays were ordered on that amendment they would be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. GREGG. Good.

Mr. President, we will now turn to the Boxer amendment, No. 3105; followed by the Bingaman amendment, No. 3121; followed by the Nelson amendment, No. 3001; followed by the Feinstein amendment, No. 3067; followed by the Stabenow amendment, No. 3118; followed by the Santorum amendment, No. 3052; followed by the Domenici amendment, No. 3128. And we reserve the right to offer an amendment after the Nelson amendment but before the Feinstein amendment relative to the same topic as the Nelson amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

AMENDMENT NO. 3105

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 3105 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] proposes an amendment numbered 3105.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase funding for the 21st Century Community Learning Center program; paid for by rolling back tax cuts for those with incomes over $1 million)

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $15,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $435,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $225,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $75,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $15,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $435,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $225,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $75,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by $750,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $15,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $ 435,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $225,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $75,000,000.

On page 18, line 24, increase the amount by $750,000,000.

On page 18, line 25, increase the amount by $15,000,000.

On page 19, line 4, increase the amount by $435,000,000.

On page 19, line 8, increase the amount by $225,000,000.

On page 19, line 12, increase the amount by $75,000,000.

On page 53, line 1, increase the amount by $750,000,000.

On page 53, line 2, increase the amount by $15,000,000.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I call this amendment the ''Gucci afterschool amendment'' because we are asking millionaires to give up one Gucci jacket or $2,000 out of their $114,000 tax cut they are going to get in 2007 so we can offer 716,000 additional children an afterschool program.

This amendment begins to fulfill the promise this President and this Congress made to our children. It will mean a big difference in every Senator's children's lives. In other words, I am looking at Senators all across this country. Every one of their States will see an increase of eligible children: in Alaska, 3,000 more children; in Florida, 33,000 more; in Indiana, 9,000 more; in Maine, 3,000 more—and it goes on—in New Hampshire, 3,000 more; in Ohio, 20,000 more; in Pennsylvania, 27,000 more; in Texas, 68,000 more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. BOXER. So I think the people earning $1 million can give up a Gucci jacket to send more children to afterschool. I urge an ''aye'' vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, first, we have already approved an extra $7 billion for these accounts here this

evening. In addition, in the budget we brought forward, we added $1.5 billion for these accounts.

This amendment is very much in the tradition of tax and spend. As the Senator from California openly admits, she wants to raise taxes significantly to pay for this new spending. But we have already committed significant dollars into these accounts, and I do not think it is necessary. So I hope we vote this amendment down.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 57, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 69 Leg.]

YEAS—43

Akaka	Harkin	Murray
Bayh	Inouye	Nelson (FL)
Biden	Jeffords	Obama
Bingaman	Johnson	Pryor
Boxer	Kennedy	Reed
Byrd	Kerry	Reid
Cantwell	Kohl	Rockefeller
Clinton	Landrieu	Salazar
Conrad	Lautenberg	Sarbanes
Dayton	Leahy	Schumer
Dodd	Levin	Snowe
Dorgan	Lieberman	Stabenow
Durbin	Lincoln	Wyden
Feingold	Menendez	
Feinstein	Mikulski	

NAYS—57

Alexander	Crapo	Martinez
Allard	DeMint	McCain
Allen	DeWine	McConnell
Baucus	Dole	Murkowski
Bennett	Domenici	Nelson (NE)
Bond	Ensign	Roberts
Brownback	Enzi	Santorum
Bunning	Frist	Sessions
Burns	Graham	Shelby
Burr	Grassley	Smith
Carper	Gregg	Specter
Chafee	Hagel	Stevens
Chambliss	Hatch	Sununu
Coburn	Hutchison	Talent
Cochran	Inhofe	Thomas
Coleman	Isakson	Thune
Collins	Kyl	Vitter
Cornyn	Lott	Voinovich
Craig	Lugar	Warner

The amendment (No. 3105) was rejected.

Mr. GREGG. I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3121

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, this amendment is one Senator SMITH and I are offering to delete section 406 from the budget resolution. Section 406 does for direct spending legislation exactly what the Senate determined not to do with discretionary spending about an hour and a half ago on the Inhofe amendment. It says that for any bill that contains direct spending, a 60-vote point of order can be raised against it. That includes the Defense bill, the farm bill, a tremendous number of bills that we try to pass through the Senate every year. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and delete that section from the budget resolution.

I yield the rest of my time to Senator SMITH.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, with reluctance I rise in opposition to this particular provision, but my reluctance vanishes when I consider the programs this would automatically affect—not just Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare but the farm program, county payments, Indian water rights, all the things that are dealt with under entitlements. I think we need to deal with those eventually as Republicans and Democrats and as Americans. We should not do it on the basis of this particular formula.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has the Senator from New Mexico offered the amendment?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I do offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN], for himself and Mr. SMITH, proposes an amendment numbered 3121.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strike the direct spending limitation)

Strike section 406.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, the characterization of this amendment has been totally inaccurate. In fact, I haven't heard as inaccurate a characterization of an amendment today, and we have heard a lot of talk today. This amendment doesn't do what was just represented. What this amendment does is, it says that for any 2-year period the trustees of the Medicare trust fund tell us that over 45 percent of the cost of Medicare or another entitlement—but it would probably be Medicare—is coming out of the general fund. Remember, Medicare is supposed to be an insurance fund; this is part A. Then at that point, there is an opportunity to raise a point of order against new entitlement spending. It specifically excludes Social Security.

The fact is, this is a point of order which will probably not come into play for many years, but it is an attempt to address what is a looming problem, which is that Medicare is taking more and more assets out of the general fund rather than being paid through the insurance process. It is good budget discipline.

Mr. CONRAD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 3121. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant journal clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 70 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Akaka	Durbin	Mikulski
Baucus	Feingold	Murray
Bayh	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Biden	Harkin	Obama
Bingaman	Inouye	Pryor
Boxer	Jeffords	Reed
Byrd	Johnson	Reid
Cantwell	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Carper	Kerry	Salazar
Chafee	Kohl	Sarbanes
Clinton	Landrieu	Schumer
Collins	Lautenberg	Smith
Conrad	Leahy	Snowe
Dayton	Levin	Specter
DeWine	Lieberman	Stabenow
Dodd	Lincoln	Wyden
Dorgan	Menendez	

NAYS—50

Alexander	Dole	McCain
Allard	Domenici	McConnell
Allen	Ensign	Murkowski
Bennett	Enzi	Nelson (NE)
Bond	Frist	Roberts
Brownback	Graham	Santorum
Bunning	Grassley	Sessions
Burns	Gregg	Shelby
Burr	Hagel	Stevens
Chambliss	Hatch	Sununu
Coburn	Hutchison	Talent
Cochran	Inhofe	Thomas
Coleman	Isakson	Thune
Cornyn	Kyl	Vitter
Craig	Lott	Voinovich
Crapo	Lugar	Warner
DeMint	Martinez	

The amendment (No. 3121) was rejected.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. It is my understanding that by unanimous consent my amendment is next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Do I need to call up amendment No. 3001?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator does.

AMENDMENT NO. 3001

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 3001.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Florida [Mr. NELSON] proposes an amendment numbered 3001.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide funds ensuring Survivor Benefit Plan annuities are not reduced by the amount of dependency and indemnity compensation that military families receive, and to provide funds for ''paid-up'' SBP, offset by closing abusive corporate tax loopholes)

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $975,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $1,037,000,000.
On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $792,000,000.
On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $826,000,000.
On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $861,000,000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $975,000,000.
On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $1,037,000,000.
On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $792,000,000.
On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $826,000,000.
On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $861,000,000.
On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by $975,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $1,037,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $792,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $826,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $861,000,000.
On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $975,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $1,037,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $792,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $826,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $861,000,000.
On page 9, line 20, increase the amount by $975,000,000.
On page 9, line 21, increase the amount by $975,000,000.
On page 9, line 24, increase the amount by $1,037,000,000.
On page 9, line 25, increase the amount by $1,037,000,000.
On page 10, line 3, increase the amount by $792,000,000.
On page 10, line 4, increase the amount by $792,000,000.
On page 10, line 7, increase the amount by $826,000,000.
On page 10, line 8, increase the amount by $826,000,000.
On page 10, line 11, increase the amount by $861,000,000.
On page 10, line 12, increase the amount by $861,000,000.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, am I allocated 1 minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, this is the widows or orphans amendment. You have already voted on this, 92 to 6, last fall. It is eliminating the offset between two different programs taking care of widows and orphans. It is a cost of war, just as providing equipment and ammunition. It is a cost of war to take care of our widows or orphans.

On the one hand, the service member pays for taking care of the survivors in the survivors benefit plan. On the other hand, the Veterans Department takes care of the dependents indemnity compensation. But those two are offset in current law. This eliminates the offset. I urge you to support the widows and the orphans.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, would the Senator agree to a voice vote?

Mr. NELSON of Florida. The Senator will agree to a voice vote as long as it passes favorably. I expect the Senator is being advised that since the Senate is on record with a 92-to-6 vote, there will be a voice vote.

Mr. GREGG. Why don't we do a voice vote.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. That is acceptable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

The amendment (No. 3001) was agreed to.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. GREGG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3164

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Ms. STABENOW] proposes an amendment numbered 3164.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a reserve fund to allow for deficit-neutral legislation that would provide seniors with a prescription drug benefit option that is affordable, user-friendly, and administered directly by the Secretary of Health and Human Services)

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. _____. RESERVE FUND TO ALLOW FOR DEFICIT-NEUTRAL LEGISLATION THAT WOULD PROVIDE SENIORS WITH A PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT OPTION THAT IS AFFORDABLE, USER-FRIENDLY, AND ADMINISTERED DIRECTLY BY THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that would—

(1) provide all Medicare beneficiaries with a Medicare-administered prescription drug plan option, while preserving the private prescription drug plan options;

(2) ensure that Medicare beneficiaries pay the lowest possible prescription drug prices by directing the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate with pharmaceutical manufacturers with respect to the purchase price of covered part D drugs on behalf of beneficiaries enrolled in the Medicare-administered prescription drug plan;

(3) improve the part D standard prescription drug benefit; and

(4) guarantee that Medicare beneficiaries receive the FDA-approved drugs they need by preventing prescription drug plans and MA-PD plans from ending coverage of drugs, or imposing restrictions or limitations on coverage of drugs, that were covered when the beneficiary enrolled in the plan until the beneficiary has the opportunity to switch plans, with an exception to such guarantee for brand name drugs for which there is a generic drug approved under section 505(j) of the Food and Drug Cosmetic Act that is placed on the market during the period in which the guarantee applies;

by the amount provided in such measure for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2011.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, this amendment would create a deficit-neutral reserve fund to provide seniors with the one prescription drug choice that they want, which they don't currently have, and that is an affordable prescription drug benefit administered directly through Medicare.

As you know, the current system has a lot of headaches right now. There are a lot of private plans—over 70 in Michigan—and there has been mass confusion. A lot of folks are actually paying more for drugs under this Part D program than they were before.

My amendment would give our seniors a new option, a Medicare-guaranteed option. Seniors today can get their Part A and Part B benefits either through a private plan or a traditional Medicare benefit plan. But they don't have that choice for their medicine. This would give them that choice. It would also direct the Secretary of HHS to negotiate drug prices on behalf of seniors choosing to get their medicines through Medicare.

This amendment simply gives seniors and disabled persons the real choice they want, which is a Medicare prescription drug benefit, where you go to Medicare and you can sign up and you know the copay and the premium. You go to the pharmacy and get your medicine. I ask for your support.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, it is beyond my understanding when the argument is made that this program is too confusing because there are too many plans, and then you add yet another plan. That is what this amendment does. They say there is too much confusion and there are too many plans, and they want to add another plan.

This amendment is going to destroy the competitive incentives and replace them with a Government-controlled regime. It puts the Government into the full-time business of setting drug prices and determining what drugs are covered. Strong competition has led to lower costs. The average premium is $25. That is 20 percent less than we expected.

This amendment would result in higher premiums. This amendment would also have a drug safety issue with it. This amendment would force plans to keep unsafe drugs in the formulary because what is on at the first of the year has to stay on through the whole year. So if Vioxx was on in January 2004 and was found unsafe in September 2004, it would still have to be on the formulary for another 3 months.

This is a Government-run plan. It increases costs and has price controls and unsafe drugs. This is just not a good amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAFEE). The Senator's time has expired. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 3164.

Ms. STABENOW. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senator was necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 60, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 71 Leg.]

YEAS—39

Akaka	Feingold	Mikulski
Bayh	Feinstein	Murray
Biden	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Inouye	Obama
Boxer	Johnson	Pryor
Byrd	Kennedy	Reed
Cantwell	Kerry	Reid
Clinton	Kohl	Rockefeller
Conrad	Lautenberg	Salazar
Dayton	Leahy	Sarbanes
Dodd	Levin	Schumer
Dorgan	Lieberman	Stabenow
Durbin	Lincoln	Wyden

NAYS—60

Alexander	DeWine	McCain
Allard	Dole	McConnell
Allen	Domenici	Menendez
Baucus	Ensign	Murkowski
Bond	Enzi	Nelson (NE)
Brownback	Frist	Roberts
Bunning	Graham	Santorum
Burns	Grassley	Sessions
Burr	Gregg	Shelby
Carper	Hagel	Smith
Chafee	Hatch	Snowe
Chambliss	Hutchison	Specter
Coburn	Inhofe	Stevens
Cochran	Isakson	Sununu
Coleman	Jeffords	Talent
Collins	Kyl	Thomas
Cornyn	Landrieu	Thune
Craig	Lott	Vitter
Crapo	Lugar	Voinovich
DeMint	Martinez	Warner

NOT VOTING—1

Bennett

The amendment (No. 3164) was rejected.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, at this point we are going to go to Senator AKAKA.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, if we could ask colleagues' indulgence for a few more minutes here, we are very close. We have made enormous progress in the last 20 minutes, 30 minutes. We are very close. If we could have colleagues' indulgence for a few more minutes, we could rapidly come to conclusion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3044

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 3044 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA], for himself and Mr. INOUYE, proposes an amendment numbered 3044.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $70,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $80,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $70,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $40,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $70,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $80,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $70,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by. $40,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by $70,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $80,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $70,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $40,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $70,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $80,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $70,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $40,000,000.

On page 23, line 24, increase the amount by $70,000,000.

On page 23, line 25, increase the amount by $70,000,000.

On page 24, line 3, increase the amount by $80,000,000.

On page 24, line 4, increase the amount by $80,000,000.

On page 24, line 7, increase the amount by $70,000,000.

On page 24, line 8, increase the amount by $70,000,000.

On page 24, line 11, increase the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 24, line 12, increase the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 24, line 15, increase the amount by $40,000,000.

On page 24, line 16, increase the amount by $40,000,000.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, my amendment would provide nonservice-connected pensions to Filipino veterans of World War II. In 1941, President Roosevelt issued an Executive order which called into the order of the Armed Forces of the United States all organized military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines. These veterans fought alongside American troops and were commanded by General MacArthur. There was no question when they were fighting that they would be treated the same as American troops. Congress betrayed these veterans by enacting the Rescission Act which deemed the service of soldiers of the Commonwealth Army of the Philippines not to be service in the United States military. This was after they already served with the U.S. military. These veterans have been waiting for 60 years to have their benefits reinstated. It is time that the United States fulfill its responsibility to these veterans.

I yield back my time.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I believe we can go to a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 3044.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 3044.

The amendment (No. 3044) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 3052

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 3052 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM], for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DAYTON, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. CLINTON, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. SARBANES and Mr. KERRY, proposes an amendment numbered 3052.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To continue providing 33 percent of the Global Fund's revenue and to contribute an additional $566,000,000 to the Global Fund for fiscal year 2007 to support grant renewals and new proposals to support international HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria programs)

On page 10, line 20, increase the amount by $566,000,000.

On page 10, line 21, increase the amount by $566,000,000.

On page 27, line 23, decrease the amount by $566,000,000.

On page 27, line 24, decrease the amount by $566,000,000.

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. UNITED STATES RESPONSE TO GLOBAL HIV/AIDS, TUBERCULOSIS, AND MALARIA.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The HIV/AIDS pandemic has reached staggering proportions. Over 40,000,000 people are living with HIV/AIDS worldwide, and 5,000,000 more people become infected each year. HIV/AIDS is estimated to kill 3,000,000 men, women, and children each year.

(2) The United States was the first, and remains the largest, contributor to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (referred to in this section as the ''Global Fund'').

(3) The Presidential Administration of George W. Bush (referred to in this section as the ''Administration'') has supported legislative language that links United States contributions to the Global Fund to the contributions of other donors, permitting the United States to provide 33 percent of all donations, which would match contributions on a 1-to-2 basis.

(4) As of the date of the approval of this Resolution, Congress has provided ⅓ of all donations to the Global Fund since its inception.

(5) The Global Fund currently estimates that during fiscal year 2007, it will renew $1,600,000,000 worth of effective programs that are already operating on the ground, and the Administration and Global Fund Board have said that renewals of existing grants should receive priority funding.

(6) The Global Fund estimates that during fiscal year 2007, it could award $1,000,000,000 in funding to proposals submitted for Round 6.

(7) For fiscal year 2007, the President has requested $300,000,000 for the United States contribution to the Global Fund.

(8) The Global Fund is an important component of the United States efforts to combat AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria, and supports approximately 350 projects in 130 countries.

(9) Through a mid-year review process, Congress and the Administration will assess contributions to date and anticipated contributions to the Global Fund, and ensure that United States contributions, at year end, are at the appropriate 1-to-2 ratio.

(10) Congress and the Administration will monitor contributions to the Global Fund to ensure that United States contributions do not exceed ⅓ of the Global Fund's revenues.

(11) The United States will need to contribute $566,000,000 more than the President's fiscal year 2007 request for the Global Fund to—

(A) fund ⅓ of renewals during fiscal year 2007;

(B) support at least 1 new round of proposals in fiscal year 2007; and

(C) maintain the 1-to-2 funding ratio.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, Senator SANTORUM and I come to the floor today to offer our amendment to increase funding for global AIDS by $566 million, raising the U.S. contribution to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB, and Malaria for fiscal year 2007 to $866 million. This amendment would raise the U.S. contribution to the fight against global AIDS to $4.8 billion in total for bilateral and multilateral programs combined.

This money is desperately needed.

This year we mark the 25 anniversary of the discovery of AIDS.

A generation has been born and come of age since then.

Twenty-five years ago, the Centers for Disease Control published what turned out to be one of the first descriptions of acquired immune deficiency syndrome in a short article in a weekly report. That article described five cases of pneumonia. It stated that these five cases ''suggest the possibility of a cellular-immune dysfunction.''

AIDS did not yet have a name, but it had an identity.

In the quarter century since those first cases were diagnosed, roughly 70 million people have been infected with HIV.

More than 22 million have died.

More than 12 million children in Africa alone have been orphaned.

Last year, 3 million people died, and 5 million people were newly infected.

Every 60 seconds, there are five more deaths from AIDS and nine more infections.

Over the next decade, an estimated 50 million more people will contract HIV.

Those numbers are devastating.

But the trajectory of destruction that AIDS has followed over the last quarter century can be changed. It is changing. In the last decade, new research and new international efforts have begun to alter that deadly equation.

Antiretrovirals mean that an HIV/AIDS diagnosis is no longer a death sentence, if one can get access to the drugs. Successful programs in Africa and elsewhere have convinced doubters that you can administer ARVs under extremely difficult circumstances. Effective prevention strategies in countries such as Uganda offer hope that the epidemic's relentless spread can be slowed.

But millions who are infected receive no treatment, and tens of millions more remain at risk.

The United States is a world leader in the battle against global AIDS. And the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB, and Malaria is one of the most effective and widest reaching weapons in our arsenal.

The amendment that Senator SANTORUM and I are offering today seeks to ensure that we maintain that leadership and maintain the extraordinary leveraging potential of our contribution.

For every dollar that the United States has provided to the Global Fund, the rest of the world has contributed two more.

The U.S. Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 linked U.S. contributions to the fund to those of other contributors.

We believe that the United States must live up to the commitment we have made to reach our one-third match. We also believe that it is very much in our interests to do so.

As Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice has stated, ''HIV/AIDS is not only a human tragedy of enormous magnitude; it is also a threat to the stability of entire countries and to entire regions of the world.''

I strongly support fully funding the President's request for bilateral HIV/AIDS programs. These programs are vitally important.

The Global Fund is a complement to our other HIV/AIDS programs, not a competitor with them. The Global Fund offers unique leveraging opportunities. It also expands our reach, well beyond PEPFAR focus countries, thus giving our assistance breadth and depth. The Global Fund reaches 130 countries around the world. It provides one-quarter of all donor HIV/AIDS spending, two-thirds of all donor TB spending, and half of all donor spending on malaria.

As of December 2005, the Global Fund was providing voluntary counseling and testing to 3.9 million people. The Global Fund is currently supporting community outreach efforts to 7 million people. It is providing antiretrovirals—ARVs—for 384,000 people.

The fund has also provided 7.7 million bed nets to prevent malaria and treated 1 million cases of TB through directly observed therapy. Malaria and TB kill 3 million people a year. There are proven, cost-effective solutions to prevent and treat these diseases, and the Global Fund helps provide them.

The President's request included $300 million for the Global Fund. But this level of funding falls far short.

It falls short of our previous contributions, it falls short of our commitment, and it falls far short of the actual need.

First, $300 million is less than what the United States has contributed to the Global Fund last year, and the year before that. Last year, the United States provided $550 million. To cut that level almost in half would have a devastating effect.

As the AIDS crisis grows ever greater, our funding should be increasing, not decreasing.

Second, funding at that level will either fall well short of the one-to-two match from the international community or, even worse, will encourage other donors to lowball their own contributions.

Just as our generosity has been matched by the rest of the world, the reverse may also be true.

Third, the President's request falls far short of what is needed.

This year, the fund estimates that it will need $1.6 billion just to renew current grants. That would require a $533 million contribution from the United States. This figure is based on the assumption that about one in six grants will not be renewed, as part of the fund's screening mechanism. The programs that will be renewed are already on the ground, providing care and treatment. Three hundred million dollars will not come close to funding renewals of proven, lifesaving programs.

That is where we must begin, with $533 million for renewals.

However, the need for expanded prevention, care, and treatment of these terrible diseases does not stay stable: it grows.

Our potential to help also increases, through proven interventions and demonstrated best practices and through the elimination of programs that do not meet standards of effectiveness or honesty.

The Global Fund must not remain static in the face of an expanding epidemic: it must grow to meet it.

Therefore, Senator SANTORUM and I believe that the United States must

also make a one third contribution to a new round of grants, at $333 million.

That would mean a total contribution of $866 million for the Global Fund from the United States.

On average, every $100 million contribution to the Global Fund will generate the following results: The Fund can provide 630,000 bed nets to fight malaria; it can deliver 150,000 treatments for malaria; it can provide 80,000 highly-effective DOTS treatments for TB; it can supply 370,000 people with HIV tests; and it can provide 11,000 people with lifesaving AIDS treatment.

Lives hang in the balance. We must not shortchange this vital program, which dramatically extends the reach of U.S. foreign assistance.

Our amendment offsets the $566 million increase in global AIDS funds with the 920 function, administrative allowances. This offset asks appropriators to find $566 million in savings across all budget functions.

We do not believe that this money should come at the expense of other international humanitarian programs.

Out of a discretionary budget of $873 billion, I don't think $566 million is too much to ask in the global fight against these diseases.

Senator SANTORUM and I will be working together through the appropriations process to make sure we find these savings.

We believe it is important to set the U.S. mark now for the Global Fund at $866 million.

This sends a clear signal to other donors that they need to step up their contributions to match this U.S. level.

I know there are many budgetary pressures, but this is literally a matter of life and death.

Twenty-five years ago, doctors first began to diagnose AIDS cases, but they could do almost nothing to save people. Then they began using AZT, which could slow the disease and, 10 years ago, ARVs, which could give people their lives back.

Sadly, for the first 10, even 20 years of this pandemic, the response of the international community to the tragedy unfolding before them was dreadfully slow.

Jan Eliasson, President of the U.N. General Assembly, has rightly declared that our slow response marks a scar ''on the conscience of our generation.''

Eliasson continues, ''We cannot turn back the clock. We must ensure that, when historians look at the way the world responded to HIV and AIDS, they see that 2006 was the year when the international community finally stepped up to the mark the year when . . . the world began to 'keep the promise.' ''

In 25 years we have made enormous strides, and yet the disease has moved faster.

I urge you to join me in supporting this amendment to ensure that the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB, and Malaria can both renew ongoing, proven programs and expand its lifesaving efforts.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, this amendment adds $566 million for the Global AIDS Fund. This is a fund that historically the United States has participated at one-third funding level. It is an encouragement and incentive for the rest of the world to contribute to end the scourge of HIV/AIDS, particularly on the continent of Africa. To be able to meet that requirement for this funding year required an additional $566 million above the President's request of $300 million. That will fund 85 percent of the renewals that are coming due this year, in addition to round six of new funding for this initiative by the Global Fund.

This is a commitment that the United States has made. We have been a leader on this. We need to continue to lead in an area that does cry out for humanitarian support and compassion by the people of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 3052.

The amendment (No. 3052) was agreed to.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. CLINTON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3111, 3110, 3057, 3067, 3147, 3089, EN BLOC

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, we have a series of amendments we wish to agree to at this time. I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table: Dodd amendment No. 3111, Hutchison amendment No. 3110, Kohl amendment No. 3057, Feinstein amendment No. 3067, Clinton amendment No. 3147, Salazar amendment No. 3089.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CONRAD. No objection on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3111

(Purpose: To establish a reserve fund for the FIRE and SAFER programs)

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. ___. RESERVE FUND FOR THE FIRE AND SAFER PROGRAMS.

If a bill or joint resolution is offered, or an amendment is offered thereto, or a conference report is submitted thereon, that provides firefighters and fire departments with critical resources under the Assistance to Firefighters Grant and the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response Firefighters Grant, the Chairman of the Committee on Budget shall adjust the revenue aggregates and other appropriate aggregates, levels, and limits in their resolution to reflect such legislation to the extent that such legislation would not increase the deficit for fiscal year 2007 and for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2011.

AMENDMENT NO. 3110

(Purpose: To provide a reserve fund to ensure that physicians will receive an appropriate reimbursement rate under Medicare instead of a scheduled cut which would threaten the adequate provision of care for seniors and disabled citizens)

''SEC. . Reserve Fund for Physician Payment Increase under Medicare. If—

(1) the Committee on Finance Reports a bill, or if an amendment is offered thereto, or if a conference report is submitted thereon, that has the effect of increasing the reimbursement rate for physician services under Section 1848(d) of the Social Security Act; and

(2) that committee is within its allocation as provided under section 102(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations and aggregates to the extent that such legislation would not increase the deficit for fiscal year 2007 and for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2011.

AMENDMENT NO. 3057

(Purpose: To restore $380 million to juvenile justice programs funded by the Department of Justice, offset by a reduction to Function 920 (Allowances))

On page 24, line 24, increase the amount by $380,000,000.

On page 24, line 25, increase the amount by $46,000,000.

On page 25, line 4, increase the amount by $106,000,000.

On page 25, line 8, increase the amount by $95,000,000.

On page 25, line 12, increase the amount by $76,000,000.

On page 25, line 16, increase the amount by $57,000,000.

On page 27, line 23, decrease the amount by $380,000,000.

On page 27, line 24, decrease the amount by $46,000,000.

On page 28, line 2, decrease the amount by $106,000,000.

On page 28, line 5, decrease the amount by $95,000,000.

On page 28, line 8, decrease the amount by $76,000,000.

On page 28, line 11, decrease the amount by $57,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3067

(Purpose: To provide $390,000,000 in fiscal year 2007 for cancer funding in the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Health Resources and Services Administration paid for by closing corporate tax loopholes)

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $111,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $199,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $55,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $12,000,000.

On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $111,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $199,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $55,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $12,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by $390,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $111,000,000.

On age 5, line 6, increase the amount by $199,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $55,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $12,000,000.

On age 5, line 12, increase the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 19, line 24, increase the amount by $390,000,000.

On page 19, line 25, increase the amount by $111,000,000.

On page 20, line 4, increase the amount by $199,000,000.

On page 20, line 8, increase the amount by $55,000,000.

On page 20, line 12, increase the amount by $12,000,000.

On page 20, line 16, increase the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 53, line 1, increase the amount by $390,000,000.

On page 53, line 2, increase the amount by $111,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3147

(Purpose: To restore funding for the Alzheimer's Association 24/7 Contact Center (under Training, Research and Discretationary Programs), Alzheimer's Disease Demonstration Grants, Preventive Health Services, Home-Delivered Nutrition Services, Congregate Nutrition Services, the Nutrition Services Incentive Program, the National Family Caregiver Support Program, and the Long Term Care Ombudsmen Program in the Administration on Aging, fully offset through closing corporate tax loopholes)

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by 13,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $13,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by $41,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $13,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 18, line 24, increase the amount by $41,000,000.

On page 18, line 25, increase the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 19, line 4, increase the amount by $13,000,000.

On page 19, line 8, increase the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 53, line 1, increase the amount by $41,000,000.

On page 53, line 2, increase the amount by $26,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3089

(Purpose: Restore $100 million to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Stateside Grant Program. Paid for by closing corporate tax loopholes)

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $25,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $25,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $25,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 13, line 21, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 13, line 22, increase the amount by $25,000,000.

On page 14, line 1, increase the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 14, line 5, increase the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 14, line 9, increase the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 14, line 13, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 53, line 1, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 53, line 2, increase the amount by $25,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3111

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise to discuss S.A. 3111 to the fiscal year 2007 budget resolution which I sponsored with my colleague, Senator DEWINE. This amendment, which helps our Nation's firefighters perform their critical duties more safely, was adopted by unanimous consent. I thank the Chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator GREGG, and the committee's ranking member, Senator CONRAD, both for their work on the budget resolution and for their consideration of this important issue.

I would imagine that this amendment, which creates a special reserve fund to pay for the assistance to firefighters grants, is not the way that everyone would choose first to provide critical resources to the FIRE Act and SAFER Act grants. However, this amendment does demonstrate the commitment of the Senate to increase conditionally funding for our firefighters in a manner consistent with the need to be fiscally responsible.

Clearly, the need for these grants is irrefutable. Across our country, fire departments are in desperate need of obtaining updated equipment and more expensive firefighter training—two activities that are crucial to ensuring that firefighters can carry out their expanded responsibilities safely and effectively in this post-9/11 world.

In fiscal year 2002, there were over 19,000 FIRE grant applications seeking almost $2 billion in support for eligible activities. In fiscal year 2005, there were over 27,000 FIRE grant applications seeking over $4 billion for such activities. The manmade and natural hazards that firefighters are expected to face today have strapped the ability of municipalities and States to provide for their needs. Therefore, it is imperative that the Federal Government expand its commitment to support our firefighters.

I think that very few people who are not firefighters stop and think about how much we ask of our firefighters in today's world. They still perform their traditional duties of extinguishing fires, delivering emergency medical services, and ensuring that fire codes are inspected. However, many firefighters have also taken on new homeland security responsibilities that include responding to and handling hazardous biological and radiological agents.

According to a national needs assessment study of the U.S. Fire Service published in December 2002, most fire departments lack the necessary resources and training to properly handle terrorist attacks and large-scale emergencies.

More specifically, the study found that, first, using local personnel, only 11 percent of fire departments can handle a rescue with emergency medical services at a structural collapse of a building with 50 occupants. Nearly half of all fire departments consider such an incident beyond their scope. Second, using local personnel, only 13 percent of fire departments say that they can handle a hazardous material incident involving chemical and/or biological agents with 10 injuries. Only 21 percent have a written agreement to direct the use of nonlocal resources to handle the situation. Third, an estimated 40 percent of fire department personnel involved in hazardous material response lack formal training in those duties. And finally, the study found an estimated 60 to 75 percent of fire departments do not have enough fire stations to achieve widely used response-time guidelines. Many fire departments are often stretched so thin that they cannot respond to fires with sufficient personnel to initiate an interior attack on a structural fire safely.

Moreover, the need for additional firefighters—both paid and volunteer—on our Nation's streets is great. According to National Fire Protection Association standards, a minimum of four firefighters is required to initiate an interior attack on a house fire. The study goes on to conclude that 73 percent of fire departments serving populations between 10,000 and 25,000 lack such personnel, 82 percent of departments serving populations between 25,000 and 50,000, 76 percent of departments serving populations between 50,000 and 100,000, 56 percent of departments serving populations between 100,000 and 250,000, 41 percent of departments serving populations between 250,000 and 500,000 people, 40 percent of departments serving populations between 500,000 and 1 million people, and

zero percent of departments serving populations at least 1 million people.

Over the past 5 years, FIRE and SAFER grants have been highly successful in enabling fire departments to acquire the resources they demand and hire the people they need. Over $3 billion in assistance as been provided to well over 20,000 fire departments in all 50 States thus far. Yet the job of ensuring that all communities receive the assistance they need and deserve is far from done.

America's firefighters are always the first ones in and the last ones out. They risk their own lives to save the lives of others. They stare danger in the face every single day because they know they have a duty to fulfill. We must recognize their contribution to our domestic safety to see to it that they have the necessary equipment and personnel they demand in order to perform their critical duties safely.

I look forward to working with Senator DEWINE and my colleagues during the appropriations season to help ensure that the maximum amount of aid is delivered to all of our firefighters.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I have offered an amendment to the budget resolution with Senator BIDEN to significantly restore funding for juvenile justice programs. Our amendment will increase funding for these programs funded by the Department of Justice by adding $380 million to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention—OJJDP—budget. The amendment accomplishes this by raising the functional total for the justice allocation by $380 million offset in function 920—which gives the Appropriations Committee the flexibility to design the exact offsets.

Let me briefly illustrate why we must put money back into these programs. Following the administration's lead, the Senate Budget Committee allocated $176 million to the OJJDP budget, which is about $167 million less than what we appropriated last year and $380 million less than the fiscal year 2002 appropriation. I am particularly disturbed that the Senate budget resolution assumes complete elimination of the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Program—JABG—which received a little less than $50 million last year. JABG provides funding for intervention programs that address the urgent needs of juveniles who have had run-ins with the law. Positive intervention and treatment at this early stage of delinquency can prevent further violent behavior and steer a young person in the right direction before it's too late.

That said, the Budget Committee seems to feel that the JABG program is ineffective. An example from my homestate of Wisconsin proves otherwise. Using Federal dollars from the JABG program, the Southern Oaks Girls School, a juvenile detention center outside of Racine, WI, built a new mental health wing to provide much-needed counseling services for the girl inmates. The administrator of this school cites a 56-percent drop in violent behavior since the new mental services have been offered. This is just one example of JABG's many successes—a record that supports keeping JABG alive and well-funded.

The same is true of title V Local Delinquency Prevention Program, the only Federal program solely dedicated to juvenile crime prevention. Title V programs include preschool and parent training programs, youth mentoring, afterschool activities, tutoring, truancy reduction, substance abuse prevention and gang prevention outreach. Nonetheless, the Senate budget assumes a 50-percent cut to title—V penny pinching now that will cost us dearly in the future. According to many experts in the field, every dollar spent on prevention saves $3 or $4 in costs attributable to juvenile crime. And who can put a dollar value on the hundreds, even thousands of young lives turned from crime and into productive work and community life by the juvenile crime prevention programs supported by title V?

The downward spiral of juvenile justice funding is a disturbing budget trend with ugly real world implications. Juvenile crime is an ongoing challenge and it is not a problem that is going to solve itself. Boosting funding for successful juvenile justice programs is the first step in addressing this challenge. Just a few short years ago in fiscal year 2002, juvenile justice programs received $556 million. Of that amount, more than $94 million went to the title V program and nearly $250 million was dedicated to JABG. We need to restore these initiatives to those robust levels and our amendment will do just that by adding $380 million to the OJJDP budget for juvenile justice programs.

We have a choice in this Congress of where we want to invest our money. We can choose to address the roots of crime and invest in our children by preventing a life of criminal behavior. We can choose to intervene in a positive manner to work with those teens that have fallen through the cracks and have had a few scrapes with the law—we can turn many of those kids around. I urge my colleagues to make the right choice this year and support our amendment which will increase funding for juvenile justice programs. We can and must do better.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3167, 3168, AND 3169 EN BLOC

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments which have not been filed be considered en bloc, and that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table: Senator BROWNBACK on a commission on accountability and review of Federal agencies, Senator BAUCUS on high intensity drug trafficking, and Senator GRAHAM relative to the Port of Charleston.

Mr. CONRAD. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3167

(Purpose: To establish a reserve fund for a Commission for Accountability and Review of Federal Agencies)

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. ____. RESERVE FUND A COMMISSION FOR ACCOUNTABILITY AND REVIEW OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.

If—

(1) the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee of the Senate reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment is offered thereto or a conferecne report is submitted thereon, that creates a Commission for the review of the performances of Federal agencies, with the purpose of recommending legislation to realign or eliminate programs or agenices that are wasteful, duplicative, inefficient, outdated, irrelevant, or failed; and

(2) the committee is within its allocation as provided under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974;

the chairman of the Committee on Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations and aggregates to the extent that such legislation would not increase the deficit for fiscal year 2007 and for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2011.

AMENDMENT NO. 3168

(Purpose: To expand funding for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA) Program, offset through reductions in Function 920. To ensure that HIDTA funding remains in ONDCP)

On page 24, line 24, increase the amount by $19,000,000.

On page 24, line 25, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 25, line 4, increase the amount by $11,000,000.

On page 25, line 8, increase the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 25, line 12, increase the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 27, line 23, decrease the amount by $19,000,000.

On page 27, line 24, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 28, line 2, decrease the amount by $11,000,000.

On page 28, line 5, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 28, line 8, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3169

(Purpose: To restore funding for a pilot project in the Port of Charleston that coordinates over 50 State and local law enforcement agencies to prevent and detect acts of terrorism and criminal activity)

On page 24, line 24, increase the amount by $27,000,000.

On page 24, line 25, increase the amount by $21,600,000.

On page 25, line 4, increase the amount by $2,700,000.

On page 25, line 8, increase the amount by $2,700,000.

On page 27, line 23, decrease the amount by $27,000,000.

On page 27, line 24, decrease the amount by $21,600,000.

On page 28, line 2, decrease the amount by $2,700,000.

On page 28, line 5, decrease the amount by $2,700,000.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, at this point we are ready to go to the Vitter amendment. Is the Senator from North Dakota ready?

Mr. CONRAD. No, we are not. We have people looking at that amendment. Could we go to Senator DOMENICI's amendment?

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant Journal clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I know Senator VITTER wants to be heard on his amendment and Senator DOMENICI wants to be heard on his amendment. There was a prior order that said Senator DOMENICI would occur after Senator SANTORUM—not an order but sort of a collegial understanding—so we will go to Senator DOMENICI, then Senator VITTER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

AMENDMENT NO. 3128

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, last year the Senate by an overwhelming majority—74 Senators voted to support the Energy Policy Act. A number of programs, projects, and activities within that act were not contained in the President's budget.

What this does, it supports an energy reserve fund paid for by ANWR receipts. In other words, ANWR is in the bill, and we allocate part of the receipts in a reserve fund to the Secretary of Energy to pay for various projects that were already voted on by the Congress that we thought were good projects. Therefore, this would fund $150 million a year for 5 years from the ANWR receipts.

I think we should do it. I urge the Senate to adopt this. It is a good way to use the funds, an appropriate way, and I believe it would add to the validity of our Energy Policy Act and make those things happen more quickly.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment by the Senator from New Mexico. This is a debate we have been through over and over again. There are some who believe that drilling for oil in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is the answer to America's energy challenge. This amendment says the proceeds from that drilling will fund all the other energy policies in our Nation.

This makes no sense whatsoever. There is no possible way that in the next fiscal year, even if we approved the drilling in ANWR, there will be proceeds that can be contributed to the Energy Policy Act funding.

Yesterday, this body had a chance to vote for real money to fund the Energy Policy Act when Senator BINGAMAN offered the amendment, and it was defeated by opposition from the other side of the aisle.

I rise in opposition to this amendment. This is no way to fund energy policy, and ANWR is not the answer to our energy prayers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant journal clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] proposes an amendment numbered 3128.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide funding for implementing the Energy Policy Act of 2005 from ANWR)

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $151,593,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $156,269,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $162,937,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $69,093,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $133,769,000.

On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $155,437,000.

On page 5, line 23, decrease the amount by $69,093,000.

On page 5, line 25, decrease the amount by $133,769,000.

On page 6, line 2, decrease the amount by $155,437,000.

On page 6, line 12, increase the amount by $69,093,000.

On page 6, line 14, increase the amount by $202,862,000.

On page 6, line 16, increase the amount by $358,299,000.

On page 7, line 2, increase the amount by $69,093,000.

On page 7, line 4, increase the amount by $202,862,000.

On page 7, line 6, increase the amount by $358,299,000.

On page 13, line 4, increase the amount by $150,000,000.

On page 13, line 5, increase the amount by $67,500,000.

On page 13, line 8, increase the amount by $150,000,000.

On page 13, line 9, increase the amount by $127,500,000.

On page 13, line 12, increase the amount by $150,000,000.

On page 13, line 13, increase the amount by $142,500,000.

On page 41, strike lines 8 through 11 and insert the following:

''ate may make the adjustments described in subsections (b) and (c).

(b) ADJUSTMENT FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005.—If the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment is offered thereto or a conference report is submitted thereon that makes available a portion of the receipts resulting from enactment of the legislation described in subsection (a) for programs to implement the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise committee allocations for that committee and other appropriate budgetary aggregates and allocations of new budget authority and outlays by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but the adjustment may not exceed $150,000,000 in new budget authority in each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011.

(c) ADJUSTMENT FOR THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND PROGRAMS AND ADDITIONAL LAND CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.—If the Committee on Appro-* * *

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 72 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Akaka	Dole	Martinez
Alexander	Domenici	McCain
Allard	Enzi	McConnell
Allen	Frist	Murkowski
Bennett	Graham	Roberts
Bond	Grassley	Santorum
Brownback	Gregg	Sessions
Bunning	Hagel	Shelby
Burns	Hatch	Specter
Burr	Hutchison	Stevens
Chambliss	Inhofe	Sununu
Coburn	Inouye	Talent
Cochran	Isakson	Thomas
Cornyn	Kyl	Thune
Craig	Landrieu	Vitter
Crapo	Lott	Voinovich
DeMint	Lugar	Warner

NAYS—49

Baucus	Durbin	Murray
Bayh	Ensign	Nelson (FL)
Biden	Feingold	Nelson (NE)
Bingaman	Feinstein	Obama
Boxer	Harkin	Pryor
Byrd	Jeffords	Reed
Cantwell	Johnson	Reid
Carper	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Chafee	Kerry	Salazar
Clinton	Kohl	Sarbanes
Coleman	Lautenberg	Schumer
Collins	Leahy	Smith
Conrad	Levin	Snowe
Dayton	Lieberman	Stabenow
DeWine	Lincoln	Wyden
Dodd	Menendez	
Dorgan	Mikulski	

The amendment (No. 3128) was agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

AMENDMENT NO. 3165

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant journal clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. VITTER] proposes an amendment numbered 3165.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: to create a Reserve Fund for Gulf Coast, Protection, Reconstruction and Recovery Fund)

On page 43, after line 22, add the following: If—

(1) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate or the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, or both Committees, reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment is offered thereto, or if a conference report is submitted thereon, that creates a Gulf Coast

Protection, Reconstruction and Recovery Fund to provide assistance to coastal states for coastal conservation, mitigation and resource protection activities, or other purposes, based on the allocation formula provided in Section 31 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act that is funded $10 billion from the following sources or any combination of funds thereof—

(A) Receipts deposited into the Digital Television Transition and Public Safety Fund that exceed estimates of the Congressional Budget Office for the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 at the time of enactment;

(B) Receipts (including bonus bids, rents, royalties, and payments associated with royalties in kind) from the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, if the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate reports a bill, and such measure is enacted, to establish oil exploration and production in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge;

(C) Receipts equal to the amount of receipts received by the United States government attributable to offshore energy production (including bonus bids, rents, royalties, and payments associated with royalties in kind) for each year that exceed estimates of the Congressional Budget Office as of March 16, 2006; and

(2) that committee is within its allocation as provided under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974;

the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations and aggregates to the extent that such legislation would not increase the deficit for fiscal year 2007 and for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2011.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant journal clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3165) was agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CONRAD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the passage of the budget—I like that—the Senate proceed to executive session and proceed to two consecutive votes on the confirmation of the following judicial nominations on the Executive Calendar: Calendar No. 547, Jack Zouhary to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Ohio; and Calendar No. 548, Stephen G. Larson to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California; further, that prior to the first vote the two Senators from Ohio be given 1 minute each, and prior to the second vote the Senators from California be given 1 minute each; that following these votes the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is time also reserved before each vote for the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and ranking member?

Mr. GREGG. There was not. But I will be happy to ask for that.

Mr. LEAHY. One minute each prior; and I wonder if the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire would be willing to amend his unanimous consent to make it in order to ask for the yeas and nays at this point on both votes.

Mr. GREGG. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered en bloc.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3031, 3089, 3170, AND 3171, EN BLOC

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be considered en bloc and that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table: A Levin amendment relative to ATP; a Salazar amendment relative to the LWCF. I further ask unanimous consent that the following amendments which have not been filed be considered and agreed to en bloc, and the motions to reconsider be laid on the table: A Conrad-Gregg amendment on tax cap; and a Gregg-Conrad amendment for Senator BYRD on mine safety.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3031

(Purpose: Provide funding for the Advanced Technology Program to help ensure America's competitive advantage and fully offset with reductions in function 920)

On page 15, line 21, increase the amount by $140,000,000.

On page 15, line 22, increase the amount by $21,000,000.

On page 16, line 1, increase the amount by $98,000,000.

On page 16, line 5, increase the amount by $21,000,000.

On page 27, line 23, decrease the amount by $140,000,000.

On page 27, line 24, decrease the amount by $21,000,000.

On page 28, line 2, decrease the amount by 98,000,000.

On page 28, line 5, decrease the amount by $21,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3089

(Purpose: Restore $100 million to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Stateside Grant Program. Paid for by closing corporate tax loopholes)

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $25,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $25,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $25,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 13, line 21, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 13, line 22, increase the amount by $25,000,000.

On page 14, line 1, increase the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 14, line 5, increase the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 14, line 9, increase the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 14, line 13, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 53, line 1, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 53, line 2, increase the amount by $25,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3170

(Purpose: To provide an additional $500 million to enhance the ability of the Internal Revenue Service to collect taxes owed but not paid voluntarily)

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by $363,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $340,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $14,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $9,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, decrease the amount by $340,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, decrease the amount by $14,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, decrease the amount by $9,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, increase the amount by $340,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, increase the amount by $354,000,000.

On page 6, line 12, increase the amount by $363,000,000.

On page 6, line 14, increase the amount by $363,000,000.

On page 6, line 16, increase the amount by $363,000,000.

On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by $340,000,000.

On page 6, line 24, increase the amount by $354,000,000.

On page 7, line 2, increase the amount by $363,000,000.
On page 7, line 4, increase the amount by $363,000,000.
On page 7, line 6, increase the amount by $363,000,000.
On page 25, line 24, increase the amount by $363,000,000.
On page 25, line 25, increase the amount by $340,000,000.
On page 26, line 4, increase the amount by $14,000,000.
On page 26, line 8, increase the amount by $9,000,000.
On page 53, line 1, increase the amount by $137,000,000.
On page 53, line 2, increase the amount by $128,000,000.
On page 55, line 13, strike $274,000,000 and insert $500,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3171

(Purpose: To provide $184 million over five years for the Mine Safety and Health Administration to hire additional mine safety inspectors)

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by $37,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $38,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $41,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $43,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $46,000,000.
On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $33,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $37,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $40,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $42,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $45,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, decrease the amount by $33,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, decrease the amount by $37,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, decrease the amount by $40,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, decrease the amount by $42,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, decrease the amount by $45,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, increase the amount by $33,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, increase the amount by $70,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, increase the amount by $110,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, increase the amount by $152,000,000.
On page 6, line 16, increase the amount by $197,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by $33,000,000.
On page 6, line 24, increase the amount by $70,000,000.
On page 7, line 2, increase the amount by $110,000,000.
On page 7, line 4, increase the amount by $152,000,000.
On page 7, line 6, increase the amount by $197,000,000.
On page 19, line 24, increase the amount by $36,000,000.
On page 19, line 25, increase the amount by $32,000,000.
On page 20, line 3, increase the amount by $36,000,000.
On page 20, line 4, increase the amount by $35,000,000.
On page 20, line 7, increase the amount by $37,000,000.
On page 20, line 8, increase the amount by $36,000,000.
On page 20, line 11, increase the amount by $37,000,000.
On page 20, line 12, increase the amount by $36,000,000.
On page 20, line 15, increase the amount by $38,000,000.
On page 20, line 16, increase the amount by $37,000,000.
On page 26, line 24, increase the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 26, line 25, increase the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 27, line 3, increase the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 27, line 4, increase the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 27, line 7, increase the amount by $4,000,000.
On page 27, line 8, increase the amount by $4,000,000.
On page 27, line 11, increase the amount by $6,000,000.
On page 27, line 12, increase the amount by $6,000,000.
On page 27, line 15, increase the amount by $8,000,000.
On page 27, line 16, increase the amount by $8,000,000.
On page 53, line 1, increase the amount by $36,000,000.
On page 53, line 2, increase the amount by $32,000,000.
On page 53, line 4, increase the amount by $36,000,000.
On page 53, line 7, increase the amount by $37,000,000.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, we are very close to being able to move toward final passage, but we still have a number of amendments to dispose of. If we can just have the patience of the body for a few more minutes, we can dispose of these final amendments and move toward final passage.

First of all, I think it is important to thank colleagues—dozens of colleagues—who have given their amendments in the last hour—we appreciate it very much—and others who were able to work with us to get their amendments agreed to as the chairman has just reviewed.

The next amendment is Senator ENSIGN. We ask colleagues to give the Senator from Nevada their attention.

AMENDMENT NO. 3166

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. ENSIGN] proposes an amendment numbered 3166.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To deny funds in FY2007 for the United Nations Human Rights Council, which the United States just voted against because countries found complicit in sustained human rights abuses are eligible for Council membership. Savings redirected to border security)

On page 10, line 20, decrease the amount by $4,000,000.
On page 10, line 21, decrease the amount by $4,000,000.
On page 24, line 24, increase the amount by $4,000,000.
On page 24, line 25, increase the amount by $4,000,000.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, just very briefly, this amendment has to do with funding for the United Nations Human Rights Council which I believe is worse than the discredited United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

Members will not be selected primarily on the basis of their commitment to human rights, even countries under Security Council sanctions for human rights violations or terrorism.

The United States has been a member of the United States Commission on Human Rights since 1947, with one exception. That will no longer be the case. Due to a rotating membership, the United States will be ineligible for the Human Rights Council membership every 6 years. So our country, which has been at the forefront of promoting human rights, would periodically lose its seat but still be required to cover 22 percent of the United Nations Human Rights Council cost.

I am proud of the United States and how we have stood firm and opposed creation of this fatally flawed council. We need to make sure we are not funding this council, and that is exactly what our amendment does. It takes away the funding from the Human Rights Council and puts it toward border security.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, this amendment reduces the international account by $4 million. That is what it does. We have no assurance that it will actually take money from the Human Rights Council, although that is the intention of the Senator. The fact is, it reduces the international account by $4 million and increases the 750 account by a like amount.

I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment. The United States did not get all the changes it wanted made with respect to the Human Rights Council, but very significant changes were made. And under Secretary Burns, they have indicated that the administration intends to work with those changes to try to improve that situation. We have a real problem with respect to that Human Rights Council. But changes are being made. They are being made in the right direction.

I very much oppose this amendment. I hope my colleagues will vote against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 73 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	DeWine	McConnell
Allard	Dole	Murkowski
Allen	Domenici	Nelson (FL)
Bennett	Ensign	Nelson (NE)
Bond	Enzi	Roberts
Brownback	Frist	Santorum
Bunning	Graham	Sessions
Burns	Grassley	Shelby
Burr	Gregg	Smith
Chambliss	Hatch	Stevens
Coburn	Hutchison	Sununu
Coleman	Inhofe	Talent
Collins	Isakson	Thomas
Cornyn	Kyl	Thune
Craig	Lott	Vitter
Crapo	Martinez	Warner
DeMint	McCain	

NAYS—50

Akaka	Feingold	Menendez
Baucus	Feinstein	Mikulski
Bayh	Hagel	Murray
Biden	Harkin	Obama
Bingaman	Inouye	Pryor
Boxer	Jeffords	Reed
Byrd	Johnson	Reid
Cantwell	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Carper	Kerry	Salazar
Chafee	Kohl	Sarbanes
Clinton	Landrieu	Schumer
Cochran	Lautenberg	Snowe
Conrad	Leahy	Specter
Dayton	Levin	Stabenow
Dodd	Lieberman	Voinovich
Dorgan	Lincoln	Wyden
Durbin	Lugar	

The amendment (No. 3166) was rejected.

Mr. SARBANES. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. MURRAY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3152 AND 3172, EN BLOC

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent the following amendments be considered, agreed to en bloc, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table: One amendment by Senators LOTT, TALENT, REED, LIEBERMAN, DURBIN, BAUCUS, and WARNER, an amendment dealing with the military, dealing with defense accounts, and an amendment by Senator SCHUMER dealing with courthouses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments were agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To provide additional new budget authority and outlay authority for fiscal year 2007 for National Defense (050) in the amount of $3,700,000,000, the amount requested for defense for fiscal year 2007 in the budget of the President for fiscal year 2006, in order to fund principal unfunded priorities of the military departments and fund an authorized end strength of active duty members of the Army of 512,400, and an authorized end strength of active duty members of the Marine Corps of 179,000, for fiscal year 2007)

On page 48, line 5, decrease the amount by $3,700,000,000.

On page 53, line 1, increase the amount by $3,700,000,000.

On page 53, line 2, increase the amount by $3,700,000,000.

(Purpose: To add $308 million to function 800 for GSA fully offset by function 920)

On page 25, line 24, increase the amount by $308,000,000.

On page 25, line 25, increase the amount by $9,000,000.

On page 26, line 4, increase the amount by $31,000,000.

On page 26, line 8, increase the amount by $65,000,000.

On page 26, line 12, increase the amount by $95,000,000.

On page 26, line 16, increase the amount by $77,000,000.

On page 27, line 23, decrease the amount by $308,000,000.

On page 27, line 24, decrease the amount by $9,000,000.

On page 28, line 2, decrease the amount by $31,000,000.

On page 28, line 5, decrease the amount by $65,000,000.

On page 28, line 8, decrease the amount by $95,000,000.

On page 28, line 11, decrease the amount by $77,000,000.

MENTAL HEALTH PARITY ASSUMPTION

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I want to begin by complimenting my friend from New Hampshire and the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee on a job well done. He has taken a difficult situation and produced the budget resolution before us today. Congratulations.

I would like to raise the issue of mental health parity as the Senate debates the fiscal year 2007 Senate budget resolution.

It is my understanding the resolution before us assumes the revenue impact of enacting a mental health parity law at a cost of $1.5 billion over 5 years. I want to make sure that it is indeed the case that the overall revenue number is such that it assumes Congress will pass a mental health parity bill.

Mr. GREGG. I understand the interest of the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico regarding mental health parity legislation and I would concur with my colleague's assessment. S. Con. Res. 83 does assume the revenue impact of enacting a mental health parity bill.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the distinguished chairman for his consideration and explanation of this important matter.

BORDER PATROL CHALLENGES

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, as the chairman may know, I recently took a trip with Senator COLEMAN to the U.S.-Mexican border to look at the challenges facing our Border Patrol agents as they work to secure the border against illegal immigration. One of our stops was at Fort Huachuca, AZ, where we saw, in operation, the lone UAV Predator B that the Customs and Border Patrol has in service. I was tremendously impressed with this technology and saw its usefulness in assisting our CBP agents in locating and interdicting illegal immigrants as they crossed the border. In fact, Mr. Chairman, while at Fort Huachuca, CBP caught 13 illegal immigrants using the Predator B right before our eyes.

In our discussions with the CBP officials at Fort Huachuca, we learned that with a squadron of UAVs the CBP could provide 24-hour-a-day, 7-day-a-week, coverage on the Mexican border. These MQ-9 UAVs would have satellite command, control, and communications which would allow them to be operated anywhere in the world from anywhere in the world, as well as an updated sensor suite to assist in finding illegals coming across the border. It is my belief that this body should make a significant investment in unmanned aerial vehicles.

We also learned that there is an issue surrounding critical spares for the lone UAV in operation. I understand the CBP is scheduled to receive a second Predator B this year; however, we need to fund the critical spares CBP needs to keep these UAVs up and flying.

Through conversations that I and my staff have had with FAA, I understand they are working out the issues surrounding the flying of UAVs within U.S. airspace. I would like to take this opportunity to encourage the FAA to continue to work with other Government agencies as well as the private sector to mitigate the problems surrounding the use of UAVs in U.S. airspace.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman has been a leader in this body on so many issues but in particular on homeland security issues. I look forward to working with you in this effort and on this issue.

Mr. GREGG. I thank my good friend and colleague from Georgia for highlighting this issue. Protecting U.S. borders is a basic Federal function; it is national security. I also believe these unmanned aerial vehicles can enhance our capabilities, as they have for our military as demonstrated in Afghanistan and Iraq. I am in the position of being both the chairman of the Budget Committee and manager of this budget resolution, and also the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee that oversees the Department of Homeland Security both our counterterrorism and border security programs.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia is known as a real leader in this area, and we appreciate his counsel. I might note that this budget resolution proposes increases of some $4 billion for border security focused on improving infrastructure and giving our men and women on the front lines

the tools to do the job. We will have to see how much of these funds survive the Appropriations Committee's 302(b) allocation process and the administration's transmittals of emergency spending. But I can assure the Senator we will take a hard look at the UAV program as a component of a border security infrastructure program.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today, I would like to take a few minutes to speak about the tax gap. Before I get started, I first want to thank my colleagues, the chairman and ranking member of the Budget Committee, for their interest in the tax gap. As chairman of the Finance Committee, I too have a great interest in this topic. It is my intention to close the tax gap, and I look forward to working with Senator GREGG and Senator CONRAD to achieve this important goal.

The tax gap, as we all know, is the difference between the amount of tax owed by taxpayers from legal activities and the amount voluntarily paid on time. Today, specifically, I want to clarify the facts and the fiction regarding the possible solutions to this $350 billion problem.

Under my chairmanship, the Finance Committee has held at least eight hearings to address the tax gap:

No. 1, Oversight of the Internal Revenue Service, ''Taxpayer Beware: Schemes, Scams, and Cons,'' April 5, 2001; No. 2, Tax Code Complexity: New Hope for Fresh Solutions, April 26, 2001; No. 3, Taxpayer Alert: Choosing a Paid Preparer and the Pitfalls of Charitable Car Donation, April 1, 2003; No. 4, Tax Shelters: Who's Buying, Who's Selling, and What's the Government Doing About It?, October 21, 2003; No. 5, Bridging the Tax Gap, July 21, 2004; No. 6, Charities and Charitable Giving: Proposals for Reform, April 5, 2005; No. 7, The $350 Billion Question: How to Solve the Tax Gap, April 14, 2005; and No. 8, Social Security: Achieving Sustainable Solvency, May 25, 2005.

During these hearings, we learned a lot about the tax gap, including several good ideas for closing it. We heard from the Joint Committee on Taxation. We heard from the Treasury Department, including IRS and TIGTA. We heard from the Comptroller General and GAO. We heard from the Justice Department. We heard from the Taxpayer Advocate. We heard from CBO. We heard from the States. We heard from the private sector, both nonprofit and for-profit. And, of course, we heard from the American taxpayer.

From the testimony of all these hearings, and the expertise of all these witnesses, we identified several truths about the tax gap:

No. 1, the tax gap is a huge problem for the tax system; No. 2, it is easy to discuss in the abstract; No. 3, there is no easy solution to the problem; No. 4, there is no one silver bullet; the tax gap can only be solved through many small steps; No. 5, enforcement is important, but any real solution to this problem will require legislative changes, the most important being Tax Code simplification; No. 6, closing the tax gap should not place an undue burden on honest taxpayers; and No. 7, taking concrete steps to close the tax gap will require a lot of political will and bipartisan cooperation.

In the spirit of bipartisan cooperation, I look forward to working with Senator CONRAD and others to solve the tax gap problem. Before we can reach a bipartisan solution, however, we first need to get on the same page regarding the facts and fiction of this issue.

A common misperception by some of my friends on the other side of the aisle is that the only thing we need to do to close the tax gap is give the IRS more money for enforcement. This myth asserts that if the IRS gets more funding for enforcement, both the $350 billion tax gap and the budget deficit will magically disappear. This myth is even being used as an offset for new spending.

The Finance Committee's tax gap hearings have emphasized the importance of IRS enforcement. In fact, this budget will provide the IRS additional resources to get the job done. However, our best estimates suggest that enforcement alone could account for only 10 percent of the tax gap, not 100 percent as purported by Senator CONRAD. But even this possible 10 percent is misleading, because it doesn't accurately reflect the reality of expanded enforcement. To achieve these kinds of returns from enforcement alone would, I fear, require us to backtrack to a time when there was serious concern about the IRS overreaching and stepping on the rights of taxpayers. We must always keep a balance between taxpayer rights and enforcement.

So yes, while I support additional enforcement, we need to keep our feet on the ground and our rhetoric in check as to how much can be achieved through enforcement and the level of enforcement that can be supported.

We must also remember that it is vital that enforcement resources be targeted properly. We need to be smart in our use of enforcement. Too often the IRS has ''no-change'' audits. That is, they have spent a lot of time going through the shoebox of receipts belonging to some person and found out there were no problems. This is a waste of IRS resources and takes up the time of honest taxpayers. I been pleased to work with Senator BAUCUS to encourage the IRS to do the research and review that will allow them to focus their attention on the bad actors and get more bang for the buck on audits and enforcement.

Let me note, too, from my work on the Commission on Restructuring the IRS that the Commission found that taxpayer service and clarity of law are vital in encouraging compliance. So many folks want to abide by their obligations as a citizen, but they can't because the law is too confusing, and they can't get the right answer. Service and simplification must be part of any effort to deal with the tax gap. I will return to simplification later in my comments.

So if enforcement can't solve the $350 billion problem, what are our other options? Well, a little over a year ago, the Joint Committee on Taxation, at the Finance Committee's request, issued a report.

This is the report right here. It is titled ''Options to Improve Tax Compliance and Reform Tax Expenditures,'' otherwise known as the ''White Book.''

This report provided about $190 billion over 5 years with some very controversial items. Let me give you some examples:

Repeal the mortgage interest deduction for home equity loans. Subject State and local workers to the Medicare tax. Apply the payroll tax to most fringe benefits. Allow the offshore activities of U.S. companies to be exempt from U.S. tax.

These are clearly controversial proposals, and I am sure there are not many in the Senate who would line up to endorse them today.

Some other ideas came out of the Finance Committee's examination of the payroll tax gap last spring. The Joint Committee on Taxation and the Treasury Department testified on the leakage in the payroll tax system. To fix this leak, we heard some of the following ideas:

Modify the determination of amounts subject to employment tax for partners and S Corporation shareholders. Provide consistent FICA treatment of salary reduction amounts. Remove the employment tax cap.

Again, many of these and other comprehensive payroll tax proposals, all which would have improved Social Security solvency, were too controversial to stand on their own.

With the lack of bipartisan cooperation on Social Security, we did not have an environment to consider these important, but controversial proposals. Perhaps, if there had been bipartisan cooperation on addressing the Social Security problem, we could have made headway on the payroll tax gap.

In addition, no discussion of methods to close the tax gap can be complete without identifying the single most important one, which is Tax Code simplification. Our tax code is just too complex. Complex laws lead to inadvertent errors as well as opportunities for intentional noncompliance. Complexity in the Tax Code also contributes heavily to taxpayer confusion and real or perceived unfairness in the tax system. And studies have shown that if taxpayers feel they are being treated unfairly by the tax system, they are less likely to be compliant. Any real effort to close the tax gap cannot be taken seriously unless Tax Code simplification is part of the proposal.

Finally, I also want to alert my colleagues to the fact that we have measures in the tax relief reconciliation bill that aim at some aspects of the tax gap. In particular, some of these are

dealing with problems we are seeing in tax-exempt entities—charitable donations and abuses of tax-exempt organizations. We have reforms of two types of charitable entities—donor advised funds and supporting organizations. Too often, people have been making donations to these organizations but retaining control and seeing an inappropriate benefit going to themselves and their family, rather than to the community and those in need.

Let my colleagues understand, the issues of donor advised funds and supporting organizations are not minor as it relates to the tax gap. The IRS recently released its ''dirty dozen'' tax scams for 2006, and throughout the thousands of pages of Tax Code and regulations, abuse of donor advised funds and supporting organizations was targeted as one of the top dozen problems.

Two years ago, the Commissioner of the IRS, in a letter to me, highlighted the abuse of donor advised funds and supporting organizations as the No. 1 problem IRS was seeing in tax-exempt entities.

I think the public would view the Finance Committee as neglecting its work if it didn't seek to shut down such abuses. The Finance Committee didn't turn a blind eye; we worked on addressing these problems and drafting reforms. These reforms of donor advised funds and supporting organizations have been drafted on a bipartisan basis and with significant comment and input from the charity sector, particularly the Nonprofit Panel. I am pleased that these measures are now in tax reconciliation and conference. I think it is important that we take steps in addressing these problems here and now.

But my point is that here is something—problems of donor advised funds and supporting organizations—labeled as one of the most dirty abuses in the entire Code, and yet I still have a few colleagues who come to me with this complaint, this change, this concern about what we are doing to stop the abuses. If the road is so full of potholes on dealing with these areas of clear abuse and relatively small dollars, I think we need to recognize the real problems ahead in dealing with the big issues in the tax gap. Unfortunately, all too often I find that the tax gap is an issue in which everyone shouts for solving in the abstract, while many of those same voices are stilled when it comes to the particulars.

In closing, I want to re-emphasize the importance of this debate. Today, I have just scratched the surface on this topic. I praise the Treasury and IRS for taking some initial steps. I applaud the chairman and ranking member of the Budget Committee for their interest in closing the tax gap, and I welcome input from other Senators as well. I will eagerly entertain any specific ideas to close the tax gap as long as they go beyond ''more money for IRS enforcement,'' and as long as they do not place an undue burden on honest taxpayers. The solution to this problem needs to be bipartisan, and it needs to be legislative. Let's sit down at the table, separate the facts from the fiction, and work together to solve this tax gap problem.

But, the bottom line for the discussion today is that the minority's point that closing the tax gap can be done just through enforcement just doesn't have merit. And, the $35 billion—and that is stretching it—that may be gotten through enforcement doesn't come close to paying for the over $100 billion in new spending that the Democrat leadership is pushing.

Mr. President, virtually all Democratic Members have had a common theme in their purported offsets for their amendments to this resolution—they would close tax loopholes to pay for whatever popular spending program is proposed. Closing corporate tax loopholes is the common refrain to pay for spending. Several Members have referred to the raisers in Senator CONRAD's substitute amendment to the tax relief reconciliation bill—and they keep trying to spend that same money over and over again.

Of the raisers in Senator CONRAD's substitute amendment, $30 billion of those are included in the Senate tax relief reconciliation bill that is now in conference between the House and Senate. Many of the proponents of these amendments that have been offered on the other side of the aisle, using tax loophole closers, were among the small minority of Members who opposed the tax relief reconciliation bill that contained offsets.

This brings me then to the amendments that have been proposed. The sponsors say they have offset the costs of the amendments by closing tax loopholes. Senator CONRAD's amendment contains the known universe of revenue raisers supported by those on the other side. If we assume that the raisers in Senator CONRAD's amendment would have raised approximately $89 billion over 10 years that is still a far cry from the cumulative demands of the amendments that have already been offered from the other side. The amendments that have been offered that propose to use those tax loophole closers as offsets total $319 in new spending. That total is as of 3:30 p.m. this afternoon. We don't have a tally for all of the additional amendments that have been proposed since then. That new spending, by the way occurs over the budget period—5 years. That means we will have to find $319 more in revenue raisers just to cover those new spending items.

Now, if you use a loophole closer that is already called for in the tax relief package that is in conference, we will also need to find another $30 billion in raisers to cover the tax reconciliation bill unless my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have decided that they are no longer interested in the tuition deduction and the low income savers credit and the work opportunity tax credit and the deduction for teacher expenses and small business expensing and, oh yes, AMT relief for nearly 20 million Americans. The Finance Committee staff hopes to use the full $30 billion that is already in conference in the Senate tax relief reconciliation bill for those important tax relief provisions.

So, if we leave the $30 billion in raisers that are in tax reconciliation out of it, we will have $59 billion in net new revenue raisers available that are supported by those on the other side. Keep in mind, I'm giving the other side a break here because I'm using 10 year numbers for the offsets. The 5 year numbers are probably less than half of the net $59 billion they could claim they are raising. If you subtract the $59 billion from the $319 billion in new spending proposed, it means the other side's amendments were short by $260 billion. That's $260 billion, Mr. President.

Now, that $260 billion needs to come from some place. It wipes out all the tax relief in the package. That means no extension of the child tax credit, marginal rate relief, marriage penalty relief, retirement security relief, or education tax relief when those provisions expire in 2011.

It also means no extension of the Alternative Minimum Tax relief ''patch'' and other extenders like the research and development tax credit.

You can't have it both ways, Mr. President.

Either the other side, if they had prevailed, would have added $260 billion in deficit spending or they would've gutted the tax relief they claim to support.

Budgets are about choices. In this case, the choices are clear. If the Democratic leadership were in control of the Senate, we would have no tax relief left in this budget or we would have added $269 billion in deficit spending. That deficit spending would be $269 billion higher than the deficits in the budget that the other side criticizes. Neither choice would be the right choice for the American people.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CRAIG. The President's budget proposal fiscal year 2007 includes a plan to change, through issuance of a new administrative ruling, the way Bonneville Power Administration, BPA, retires its debt to the Federal Treasury. The plan would require BPA to use excess revenues to retire long-term debt more quickly. Because the change would be made through the rulemaking process, congressional approval would not be needed for the rule to go into effect. Analysts believe the proposed rule would result in 10-percent rate increase that BPA would be forced to pass on to ratepayers.

This rate proposal is not acceptable. The Northwest is a region that is growing very rapidly, and our economy is built on hydropower. That means each year is different, depending on what

kind of water year we have had. This proposal would limit BPA's flexibility to deal with the bad water years by taking advantage of the good ones.

According to a February 8, 2006, analysis by the Northwest Power and Conservation Council, the Office of Management and Budget, OMB, proposal will result in a retail rate increase of at least 6.6 percent, raising power rates $145 million a year, costing retail customers an additional $26.13 a year, decreasing personal income in the Northwest by $109 million, and resulting in the loss of 1,120 jobs. The Pacific Northwest economy is only beginning to rebound from the recent recession, and increasing energy costs will only serve to slow that recovery. Surely, it is preferable to foster longer-term economic growth in the region rather than focus on a short-term revenue stream for the U.S. Treasury.

Some assert that this proposal is good business practice because it prepays BPA's Federal debt. I disagree because the full story is not being told. While it is not unusual to prepay debt, it is certainly unusual for the Government to require this. In fact, this proposal is one-sided. It takes excess revenues away from BPA during good water years but does not assist BPA in bad water years.

BPA has been prepaying debt for more than 20 years, even when our Northwest States had the second and third highest unemployment in the country. Power rates were not raised to do this. So why is the Government requiring prepayment of debt and an increase in power rates when the Northwest has been successful in prepaying debt without impacting rates? This does not make sense unless there is another reason for the proposal.

According to the Department of Energy, DOE, the main purposes of the proposal are to allow more financial flexibility for BPA and to help build more transmission infrastructure. We agree with these goals but think the individuals in the region can better decide how to accomplish them.

Unfortunately, it seems this proposal would result in the establishment of BPA as a revenue raiser for the Treasury—a questionable precedent and one BPA will not always be able to achieve. This proposal must be stopped.

Senators CRAPO, WYDEN, and MURRAY have successfully inserted section 312 into S. Con. Res. 83, which relates to requiring BPA to use excess revenues to prepay long-term debt. I commend my colleagues for their effort and support their provision, but this is just the first step in making sure that this proposal does not go forward. Our work is far from over.

I will continue to work with my colleagues to put this issue to rest.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the Levin-DeWine amendment would provide $140 million to the Advanced Technology Program to support cost-shared industry-led research and development of cutting-edge high-risk technology with broad commercial potential and societal benefits. The amendment is fully offset with reductions in function 920.

The Senate has voted twice recently in support of this program. Last year the Senate voted to adopt a Levin-DeWine budget amendment to provide for the Advanced Technology Program, ATP. The Senate defeated an amendment that would have eliminated the ATP Program during consideration of the fiscal year 2006 Commerce-Justice-Science appropriations bill.

We have lost nearly 2.8 million manufacturing jobs since January 2001. We should be doing all we can to promote programs that help create jobs and strengthen the technological innovation of American companies and produce the systems that are defending our national security. This budget resolution includes $28 billion for agriculture but includes very little for manufacturing.

In fiscal year 2006 the Senate funded ATP at $140 million, but because the House zeroed out the program, ATP ended up with only $80 million in conference. The Senate needs to again provide $140 million for ATP to help ensure this program has at least last year's level of funding.

The ATP is a very modest program which, according to the Department of Commerce, has had a result eight times more in technologies developed than the amount of money we have put into the program. This is an eight-time return on investment in advanced technologies which is achieved when the Department of Commerce partners with industry through the ATP. I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, as a statement of priorities and a vision of where we want our nation to be in the years to come, this budget fails the test of responsible leadership. Instead of correcting the mistakes of the past few years, this budget repeats and compounds those mistakes. It adds to record levels of national debt. It favors the fortunate few over everyone else who is working hard and playing by the rules. It does far too little for the most vulnerable and needy Americans—our children, our seniors, our veterans. Unlike China, India, and other countries, it invests only a minute fraction of our resources in research and development. We've seen where this agenda has led us—it represents a stunning failure to address any of the major challenges of our era, like globalization, security, stagnant incomes, and rising income inequality.

America has always been blessed with great natural resources. But in spite of these physical resources, our greatest strength has always been our human ones—the American spirit of ingenuity, creativity, and old fashioned hard work. Regrettably, the budget before this body fails to make the necessary investments to build and maintain the strength of our human capital, America's greatest asset. This may not be intentional; I presume that President Bush and my colleagues across the aisle believe just as strongly in boosting our nation's economic competitiveness. But regardless of their intentions, the fact is that mismanagement, misplaced priorities, and misguided faith in outdated economic ideologies continue to set us back.

On Friday of last week, an article appeared on an international news wire that is rather stunning in its implications for the budget resolution now pending before the Senate. The headline of this article, Mr. President, reads, ''China to Boost Science, Tech Spending by Nearly 20 Percent.'' The story continues:

> ''China will increase its spending on science and technology by nearly 20 percent this year in a move to remain competitive in the face of international challenges, the government said . . . The State Council, or cabinet, last month said 2.5 percent of China's gross domestic product (GDP) would be allocated to spending on research and development over the next 15 years, up from 1.23 percent in 2002.''

''The government,'' the article goes on to say, ''will not only allocate more money but also encourage all segments of society, including companies, to put emphasis on research and development through measures including tax incentives.''

Finally, it quotes the Minister of Science and Technology as telling the National People's Congress, ''Without progress on science and technology, it would be very hard to reach our target of becoming a well-off society.''

On one level, we as Americans should welcome the decision by virtually any country to invest more in science and technology. In fact, if more nations were to make a similar decision, the world as a whole would greatly benefit by peaceful advances in commerce and in finding solutions to some of the planet's most intractable problems.

But this news from China should also serve as a reminder to Americans, as we consider our budget priorities for the upcoming year and our vision for the future, of the commitment it takes to remain a leader in the global economy. Even with the passage of the amendment to increase Labor, Health, and Human Services funds offered by Senators SPECTOR and HARKIN, of which I was a cosponsor, this budget regrettably falls short.

The average American family over the last few years has been working harder and harder just to tread water. A household earning the median income made $1,600 less in 2004 than they did 4 years earlier. Meanwhile, during the same period, the average family's health insurance premiums have risen by $3,600, or 57 percent. Their energy costs continue to rise—even though many parts of the country had warmer than usual weather this winter, families can still expect to pay more than $250 extra this year to heat their homes. If they have a child attending a public 4-year college, that bill has gone up by 57 percent since 2000, as well.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim that this budget sets us

on a path to fiscal responsibility. But as the Senator from North Dakota, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, has pointed out time and again before this body, that is anything but the case. Instead of saving for the retirement of the baby boomers—which is already beginning—we're borrowing like there's no tomorrow.

In 2000, we had a budget surplus of $128 billion; in 2006, largely as a consequence of the fiscal recklessness of this administration and the majority party in the Congress, the Federal Government is expected to run a deficit of $371 billion. Under this administration, the president and his allies will have added $3 trillion to our national debt by the end of this fiscal year. That would put America's public debt at more than $8.6 trillion, or around $28,000 for every man, woman, and child in America. Further, under the current administration, the share of that debt held by foreign creditors has more than doubled.

And it's not just the Federal Government that's borrowing, but the economy as a whole. Our personal savings rate in January was negative 0.7 percent, the 10th consecutive month for which it was effectively zero or below. Our current account deficit continues to set new records; it was an unprecedented $805 billion in 2005.

This dramatic run-up in the debt has real costs for America's families—both today and for future generations. It puts upward pressure on interest rates for things like student loans, home mortgages, and automobile loans. It raises the cost of capital for business investment. Rising interest rates, caused by America's growing indebtedness, represent a de facto tax increase on American families and businesses.

This administration's fiscal recklessness has also hurt our ability to address our nation's most important priorities, like education and health care, that strengthen our economic competitiveness and allow more Americans to share in greater prosperity. This budget provides a clear illustration of this failure, with the drastic cuts it would make in these areas.

The budget proposed by the Bush administration and my colleagues across the aisle would make the largest cut in our Nation's commitment to education in the 26-year history of the Education Department. These cuts will adversely affect students at all levels of learning. Investment and competitiveness begin with our children. As I have said many times before, education may be expensive, but ignorance costs more.

As I noted earlier, college tuition and fees have increased 57 percent for a public 4-year college. They have risen 32 percent for a private 4-year college since 2000. Yet instead of helping middle class families meet these skyrocketing college costs, this budget proposes to once again freeze the maximum Pell grant award at $4,050. In 1975, a Pell grant covered 80 percent of the cost of a public, 4-year college education; today, it covers only 40 percent. Surely we can do better than this for America's families. A college education should be a gateway to a better life for anyone willing to work for it, not just a privilege for those who can afford it.

This budget also continues to underfund K–12 education. The president and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle tout their commitment to education in the No Child Left Behind law. But this law is underfunded by $15.4 billion this year. The budget also cuts Head Start, afterschool programs, and child care, all of which prepare our children to learn better and help parents keep their kids in school and off the streets.

While countries like China are increasing their investments in science and technology, this budget would make a commitment in these areas that is little more than cosmetic. President Bush has talked a great deal about his so-called ''American Competitiveness Initiative,'' but under the budget he sent to the Congress, he would actually cut overall R&D funding in real terms for the first time since 1996. As a share of the economy, total Federal R&D funding would fall below 1 percent for the first time since fiscal year 2003.

One of the casualties would be biomedical and cancer research through the National Institutes of Health. Just two months ago, President Bush signed into law the first cut to NIH funding since 1970. Now, he has proposed further cutting funding for 18 of the 19 institutes in Fiscal 2007, including the ones conducting research on two of America's leading causes of death: cancer and heart disease.

The administration's proposals are reflected in the budget before this body today, which carries the same low level of overall discretionary spending. So while countries like China are setting goals like boosting R&D funding to 2.5 percent of Gross Domestic Product by 2020, we have nothing but a catchy slogan and cuts in the kinds of investments we need to stay strong.

This budget increases costs for entrepreneurs and small businesses. President Bush likes to say that his high-income tax breaks have benefited small business owners, but in reality, the distribution of benefits to small business owners has followed the same pattern as it has for everyone else—those with the highest incomes have received the most, and everyone else has been stuck with the bill. Among Americans with small business income, more than half of the benefits of the 2001 and 2003 tax breaks have been spent on those making more than $200,000 a year, or less than 8 percent of all small business owners, according to the nonpartisan Urban-Brookings Tax Policy Center. So while few small businesses have gained anything meaningful from the tax breaks, the administration this year is proposing to increase their cost of capital by charging a new fee for Small Business Administration loans. This would be a direct tax increase on one of our most important engines of growth. For an administration that claims to value small business, the record fails to live up to the rhetoric.

This budget fails the test of economic leadership not only by cutting investments in American competitiveness, but by abandoning our most basic American values. As Americans, we proudly look out for the least fortunate among us. Unfortunately, this budget fails to do this. It asks struggling parents to work more hours, but cuts the child care that helps them do it. It cuts funding for children's hospitals, like Hartford's Connecticut Children's Medical Center in my home state. Children's hospitals like CCMC train 30 percent of the Nation's pediatricians and more than 50 percent of the nation's pediatric specialists. This budget cuts food aid for senior citizens, pregnant women, and children. It cuts housing assistance and freezes funding that helps homeless veterans find work.

By adopting this budget, the president and his allies in the Congress would continue to walk away from one of America's bedrock principles: that everyone in our nation should have an equal opportunity to live a free and meaningful life.

While some of the amendments considered by this body appear on the surface to rectify some of the cuts this budget would make to vital priorities, they in reality fail to live up to their billing. The amendment offered by Senator MCCONNELL, for example, claimed to support port security, which should be one of our nation's highest priorities. It would have done so, however, through a budgetary gimmick that would result in an across-the-board cut to other areas, including, ironically, homeland security and national defense. It also would have provided no new funds beyond the already specified discretionary spending cap. Instead, it would have offered nothing more than non-binding instructions to the Appropriations Committee about how to allocate the funds under its jurisdiction. For this reason, I supported the port security amendment offered by Senator MENENDEZ instead of the McConnell amendment. The Menendez amendment would have provided the funds we need for this critical priority without making other cuts, and done so in a fiscally responsible manner by shutting down tax shelters and closing corporate tax loopholes, measures that have already passed this body on a bipartisan basis but which have not become law.

In the last few years, the American economy has weathered the storm of terrorist attacks, a downturn in the business cycle, natural disasters, and war. This is a testament to the strength and resiliency of the American people. But I wonder how much more our Nation can take of mismanaged economic policies and wrong priorities; of underinvestment in people, ideas, and innovation; and of an

agenda that increases the burden on the most vulnerable members of our society rather than lightening it, before we do irreparable harm.

If we want to continue to increase living standards and expand the capabilities of our society so that all may benefit, we must continue to invest in people, ideas, and innovation. We need a budget that will make our Nation stronger and more vibrant. We need more than just cosmetic solutions to the major challenges of our era. Above all, we need our government's priorities to reflect the values of the American people, like opportunity and responsibility, and the American vision of shared prosperity, expanding freedoms, and a just society. Regrettably, the budget offered by the President and by my colleagues across the aisle fails to accomplish these goals and fails to make the changes necessary to put our Nation back on the right course.

Mr. President, I have filed an amendment that will restore crucial investments to support our children and families in the fiscal year 2007 budget. I am joined on the amendment by Senators KENNEDY, CLINTON, HARKIN, MIKULSKI, MURRAY, DURBIN, LIEBERMAN, CANTWELL, KERRY, SALAZAR, BAUCUS, SCHUMER, LAUTENBERG, KOHL, and LINCOLN. It is important that we shift priorities and resources toward young children and families, to create an environment for healthy development and to help parents give their children the best possible start in life. Children represent one-quarter of our population but 100 percent of our future. We must nurture their growth and education as they provide the human capital that will determine our Nation's success in the global economy.

Today our families are working harder to pay for basic needs such as housing, fuel, health care, and childcare. At the same time, real income has decreased over the past 4 years. As a result, many hard-working families are finding it more difficult to make ends meet.

If our Nation is going to compete with the rest of the world, we must prepare our children for this challenge. It is essential that we cultivate the potential of each and every child. How can we know who may be a Nobel laureate, who may take us further into space, or who may be our future President, if we do not give them all an equal chance to thrive?

We all agree that we should not burden our children and grand children with great debt. Nor should our Nation abandon their need for health care, education, and other necessities.

As I said earlier, the amendment focuses on crucial assistance to children and families. The amendment is very simple. It takes several initiatives which have bipartisan support and restores the investments to a level that the Congress has already agreed to—in previous authorization or spending measures.

This amendment would increase resources by $3.3 billion in the fiscal year 2007 budget resolution for five programs: the childcare and development block grant by $540 million; Head Start by $520 million; 21st Century Community Learning Centers by $1.5 billion; Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act programs by $105 million; and the community services block grant by $650 million. In addition, it reduces the Federal deficit by $3.3 billion and pays for itself by closing corporate tax loopholes that were passed by the Senate in the tax reconciliation bill in February.

This amendment attempts to renew investments that have failed to keep pace with our Nation's needs. This proposal will restore the community services block grant to $650 million, the level Congress appropriated in fiscal year 2002; the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act initiatives to $200 million for the level authorized for fiscal year 2004; and restore funding to the level of $7.2 billion for Head Start to keep pace with inflation and recent across-the-board cuts.

In addition, the amendment brings the investment in afterschool up to $2.5 million, the level authorized for 21st century community learning centers in the No Child Left Behind Act. The childcare and development block grant investment will reach a level of $2.66 billion from its previous level-funding of $2.06 billion, if the amendment passes.

We must invest in our children and improve their lives. Each day, 12 million children ages 0 to 4 spend much of their day in out-of-home child care while their parents work. In a majority of cases, having both parents work is a necessity, not a choice.

Currently, about one in seven children who are eligible for childcare and development block grant—CCDBG—subsidies are receiving assistance. With childcare costing between $4,000 and $10,000 a year, many families simply can not afford to pay for the care they need. Average child care fees for a year exceed 10 percent of the median household income in most States. Not only is childcare an essential support for hard-working families, it is an important early education opportunity for children.

With respect to Head Start, only 50 percent of eligible children are enrolled in Head Start classes. Costs are rising for transportation, heating, and cooling, health insurance, and supplies. Some centers have cut back hours and days of service to children and let teachers go. Our children deserve a high-quality opportunity to learn and thrive through Head Start, and we should give more children that chance.

As they struggle to reach their own potential and achieve financial stability, working families require support. Community services block grant initiatives serve 15 million individuals, 6 million families and 3.7 million children. Forty-four percent of those receiving funds are gainfully employed, but they may still have trouble affording the cost of heating their home, putting food on the table, or sending their children to a quality childcare program. While each Federal dollar spent leverages more than $5 in State, local and private funding, the Federal investment is still essential to helping hard-working people get ahead.

At the very least, we must keep children from harm. Each year, nearly 3 million cases of child abuse and neglect are reported, and nearly 1 million of these cases are substantiated. States lack the resources necessary to investigate suspected cases, to protect children, and to prevent abuse and neglect from occurring. The Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act—CAPTA—helps communities maintain and expand efforts to improve children's lives. The amendment seeks to increase this important investment.

All of our children and families deserve a fair start. We know that investments in children pay dividends later in life. But it takes financial commitment and an understanding that we cannot waste a day of a child's life, leaving that child to play catchup later.

Families are asking for our help. I ask my colleagues to join me in heeding their call and supporting this amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, every year the Senate considers a budget resolution that sets forth the blueprint for the Government's spending and revenues. Unfortunately, the budget we are considering this year continues the administration's policies that have led to the deepest deficits and debt in American history. It also reflects the wrong priorities by cutting important programs like education and Medicare to fund large tax cuts which mostly benefit the richest among us.

The result of these irresponsible fiscal policies is that we are passing on a huge burden to our children and grandchildren and threatening our economic security. Our Nation is currently $8.2 trillion in debt—that's over $27,000 per person—and this astounding number is only getting worse. Earlier today the Senate voted to raise the Federal debt limit for the fourth time in 5 years, meaning we've increased our debt by $3 trillion since 2002. A sensible budget resolution would try to curb this unsustainable trend; unfortunately, this budget moves in the wrong direction. Under this budget, the national debt would grow to $11.8 trillion in the next 5 years.

Continued deficits will mean rising long-term interest rates and slower economic growth. Continued deficits will make it more expensive to buy a house, pay for college, or pay off credit card debt. Alan Greenspan recently warned that, if left unchecked, deficits ''would cause the economy to stagnate or worse.'' Continued deficits will also mean the continued use of the Social Security Trust Fund to cover the funding shortfalls.

Instead of changing course, however, this budget proposes to make the administration's tax cuts permanent.

Over 10 years, the cost of making tax cuts permanent would be approximately $2.8 trillion, or $3.3 trillion when the added interest payments on the debt are included. Although the cost of the President's tax breaks are as large as the entire budgets of the Departments of Agriculture, Labor, Education, Veterans Affairs, Transportation, Justice, Interior, Energy, State, HUD, and EPA combined, his budget cuts critical programs which are a small percentage of the deficit problems his tax breaks create.

On a positive note, I was able to get an amendment included in this budget to provide $140 million to the Advanced Technology Program to support cost-shared industry-led research and development of cutting-edge high risk technology with broad commercial potential and societal benefits. America has lost nearly 2.8 million manufacturing jobs since January 2001. We should be doing all we can to promote programs that help create jobs and strengthen the technological innovation of American companies and produce the systems that are defending our national security.

I am also pleased that the Senate agreed to my amendment to add $6 million to the budget for the establishment of new Northern Border Air Wing sites. Northern Border Air Wings have been operational in New York and Washington since 2004 and I look forward to the opening of additional sites in Michigan, North Dakota, and Montana in the coming years. These sites will help improve critical air and marine interdiction capabilities along our Northern Border.

I am also pleased that the budget includes an important amendment that Senator STABENOW and I offered that will improve inspections of trash trucks entering the U.S. from Canada. These trucks pose a threat to our security and the environment, and this amendment is a critical step towards reducing these risks.

I am also pleased that the Senate adopted an amendment to the budget resolution to fund the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, LIHEAP, at its full authorized level of $5.1 billion. This amendment would increase the LIHEAP funding for 2007 by $3.318 billion and offset the increased spending by closing corporate tax loopholes. The Senate has voted on five previous occasions to support full funding for the LIHEAP program, and I hope that this time the conferees on the budget resolution will retain this amendment. Full funding for LIHEAP will ensure that States are able to serve more people in need of assistance during both the cold winter months.

While there are certainly some positive inclusions in this budget package, it is entirely too fiscally irresponsible and short-changes too many important programs for me to vote to support it.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I have serious reservations about this budget and will vote against it.

At their best, budgets ought to embody discipline, vision, and accuracy. Not so for this budget. While it claims fiscal discipline, that claim is belied in the budget's bloated bottom line. While it claims strategic vision, that vision is a blurred blend of wasted dollars, missed opportunities, and neglected priorities. While it claims financial accuracy, that accuracy is of the quality found in an Enron balance sheet.

The tax portion of the budget resolution is remarkable, not for what it contains, but for what it omits. It fails to account for the expiration of alternative minimum tax relief at the end of 2006. The AMT currently captures approximately 4 million, mostly middle-class, families and individuals in its high tax trap—a trap meant to catch only high-income taxpayers who take advantage of complicated loopholes to avoid paying their fair share. That number would swell to more than 34 million people in 2011 under this budget.

Instead of AMT reform, this budget contains $228 million to accommodate tax cuts that were included in the House and Senate passed reconciliation bills currently in conference. I voted against the Senate tax reconciliation bill because I could not support unnecessary tax cut extensions at a time of burgeoning deficits. The deficits are still burgeoning, and I still oppose those unneeded and unjustified tax breaks for our highest income taxpayers.

The budget's generosity to high-income taxpayers is offset by its miserly treatment of our Nation's educational system. The budget proposes the largest cut to federal education funding in the 26-year history of the Education Department. Students, educators, parents, and administrators all lose out. Under this budget, funding for No Child Left Behind and special education will still fall far short of their authorized levels. The same holds for Career and Technical Education, Safe and Drug Free Schools, and TRIO programs. I commend Senators SPECTER and HARKIN for their successful amendment to restore some of these deeps cuts, and hope their provision will survive conference with the House.

As ranking member of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, I am also troubled that some of the most painful cuts in this budget would fall on important programs at the Administration on Aging. The meager funding levels in this budget would put Meals on Wheels and Family Caregiver Support Services on the chopping block. That means that, while Wisconsin's senior population continues to grow from 705,000 senior citizens in 2000 to 730,000 seniors this year, and is projected to grow to 1.2 million seniors by 2025, this budget will not keep pace with needed services in Wisconsin or any other State.

Funding for geriatric health professions is also likely to suffer. Title VII funding for geriatrics training is the only Federal program that specifically develops academic geriatricians at a time when more are needed. In prior years, Congress has demonstrated its strong support for the program through continued and increased appropriations over the past five years, including $31.5 million in fiscal year 2005. I was disappointed that the fiscal year 2006 Labor, HHS bill eliminated this program, and I am even more concerned that the budget before us makes it difficult, if not impossible to restore it in fiscal year 2007. Delegates to the recent White House Conference on Aging ranked increased training in geriatrics among their top ten resolutions at the once in a decade meeting in December of 2005. Clearly, this budget does not adequately prepare for our aging population.

Nowhere is that more clear than in the budget resolution's treatment—or lack thereof—of the Medicare prescription drug benefit. During consideration of this budget, many of us worked to improve that benefit. The launch of the drug benefit has been confusing and complicated for too many seniors and people with disabilities. Medicare beneficiaries who do not choose a plan by the May 15 deadline and enroll at a later date will face a substantial and permanent penalty. I cosponsored an amendment to extend the enrollment period through all of 2006 to give people additional time to make the best plan choice for them. This amendment would have also allowed a one-time change in plan enrollment at any point in 2006.

Enrolling in drug plans has been challenging and confusing for too many beneficiaries, and it makes sense to give them a chance to correct an initial mistake made during this difficult first year of implementation. Unfortunately, our amendment failed by one vote and the Senate instead gave Medicare managers discretionary authority to decide to extend the enrollment deadline for the drug benefit. While I voted for that amendment because I believe it is important to send a strong signal, I am concerned by recent comments made by the President and Medicare officials. Those comments clearly show their resistance to giving seniors more time to make a careful decision about what drug plan they will be locked into for the remainder of the year.

In addition, under current law, prescription drug plans can change the drugs they cover as many times as they want—while seniors are prohibited from changing drug plans except during the annual open enrollment period. This means that after seniors complete their research and choose the drug plan they believe is the best plan for their needs, they have no guarantee that their drugs will continue to be covered all year. That is why I cosponsored an amendment that would prohibit Medicare prescription drug plans from removing a drug from their approved list until the beginning of each plan year. This would ensure that seniors will not lose coverage of the drugs

they take without being allowed to also change their plan.

Finally, one of the most troublesome features of the new law is that it prohibits the Government from utilizing the tremendous purchasing power of the Medicare program to reduce prices. I cosponsored an amendment to repeal this provision and allow the Federal Government to negotiate directly with drug companies for lower drug prices for seniors. I am pleased the amendment passed and I hope this provision will remain in the final resolution.

The budget was also improved by an amendment, of which I was an original sponsor, on the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program, MEP. The amendment, which was unanimously accepted, would fund the MEP at $106 million for fiscal year 2007. I am a longtime supporter of the MEP program and believe manufacturing is crucial to the U.S. economy. By offering resources, including organized workshops and consulting projects, to manufacturers, MEP allows them to streamline operations, integrate new technologies, shorten production times, and lower costs. At a time when we want to increase economic activity and strengthen the manufacturing base of our nation, the MEP is a fiscally sound investment.

I am similarly pleased that this budget was amended to include adequate funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program. I voted to include $5.1 billion in order to fund this valuable program at its fully authorized level. Just a few months ago the Congress passed an energy bill, which I supported, which funded LIHEAP at $5.1 billion. This was a sorely needed update to a program where the funding has been frozen at an inadequate amount for years. There was bipartisan support for the Energy Bill, and I am pleased the Congress met the commitment we made in that bill.

But even those improvements—important as they are to me—fail to make up for one of the central and most disturbing inadequacies of this budget. This budget simply fails to provide adequate resources to take care of our returning troops. Once again the President's budget requires the Veterans Administration to charge veterans an enrollment fee and increases the co-payments for veterans receiving medical care through the VA system. These charges add insult to injury when veterans are also being forced to wait for months before they are able to see a doctor at the local VA hospital. Senator AKAKA's amendment tried to remedy this situation by adding an additional $1.5 billion to the budget, but his responsible approach was rejected.

We face unprecedented challenges in our Nation today. War and terrorism demand our resources and attention. An aging population struggles to find the money to educate the next generation while battling sky high health care costs. Our powerful economy fights to create high quality jobs in a world market of constant technological innovation and fierce international competition.

We need a budget that that sees and meets these challenges clearly—vision. We need a budget that faces the difficult realities of our world today with honest proposals and precise numbers—accuracy. And we need a budget that does what we should and must and no more—discipline. We have a budget that does none of that, and so I will vote ''no.''

AMENDMENT NO. 3116

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Mr. President, some of my colleagues may be surprised to learn—like I was—that some agencies are skimming off the top a portion of some of the congressional appropriations and keeping that money in that agency.

My amendment is simple. It says: If it has been determined that a constituency warrants a direct appropriation—one that has gone through the scrutinizing process and is supported by the House, Senate and then signed into law—then that constituency should receive the full amount.

Bureaucrats at the agencies should not be unilaterally determining that some sort of ''surcharge'' should be assessed to these projects. It amounts to a tax on our constituents. And it usurps the authority of Congress by circumventing the legislative process and giving nameless faceless bureaucrats the authority to alter legislation after it is signed into law.

And in the case where our constituents determine that the full amount of the earmark is not needed and turns back some of the funding to the government—this amendment says that instead of going to bureaucrats in the agencies to spend as they wish—it should instead go towards deficit reduction.

I offer this amendment because long before some started discussing concerns about the appropriations process, I identified—with the assistance of the Congressional Research Service—and have made an effort to investigate this practice of skimming from Congressional appropriations. Let's just say our efforts thus far have been less than successful: almost half of the agencies that have been contacted for information have not bothered to respond.

Each year, I invite Nebraskans—including community officials and nonprofit groups—to propose investments that help ensure some of their tax dollars are returned to the state. I am often approached by Nebraskans seeking help with a project that has been identified as a priority by local officials or others in the community. I support these direct investments only after they have been proposed by Nebraskans and been subjected to reviews to ensure they are both necessary and responsible.

In the absence of a full accounting of how the agencies handle this practice, I am working with the information that has thus far been shared with me. I plan to continue my efforts to seek out information on this practice by the agencies. I can assure this body that as the budget process moves forward this year, I will continue in my efforts to crack down on this practice by agencies to skim some off some of these funds.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I oppose this budget. This administration has chosen to continue down an unsustainable economic path. They have put forth an irresponsible budget that does not take constructive steps toward righting our Nation's fiscal course. I strongly urge my Senate colleagues not to follow suit.

Our Nation is going in the wrong direction. The signals grow more evident each day.

Deficits are at record levels. The debt is reaching astronomic heights. And we have fewer resources available for important domestic programs.

Under President Clinton, we had 4 years of budget surplus. And, when he left office, we had a projected 10-year surplus of $5.6 trillion.

But the economic policies of the past 5 years have produced a catastrophic turnaround. Record budget surpluses have given way to record deficits—projected at $1.6 trillion over the next decade. And the debt is projected to exceed $11 trillion.

This budget resolution assumes that the deficit will decline from $359 billion in FY 2007 to $177 billion in FY 2011. Unfortunately, these numbers don't tell the whole story.

This is a 5-year budget. This clouds the full impact of the administration's policies. The debt and deficit are set to explode in the out years—the end of the 10-year window. And, this does not even include the costs of ongoing military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan beyond 2007 and reforming the alternative minimum tax beyond 2006.

When all costs are included, this budget proposal will contribute $1.14 trillion to the Federal budget deficit over the next 5 years.

In this year alone, our national debt is slated to increase by $654 billion. This is a far cry from the President's goals for deficit reduction, and deeply troubling to those who value fiscal responsibility.

As a result, we are now again confronted with raising the nation's debt limit. The increase—from $8.2 trillion to roughly $9 trillion—will be the fourth major hike in the last 5 years.

In 2000, our national debt was at $5.8 trillion. Today, this figure stands at $8.27 trillion. And, at this rate, with all costs included, debt will more than double to $12 trillion in 2011.

Additionally, more and more of our debt is being held in foreign hands. We now owe Japan $685 billion and China over $250 billion. It took 42 Presidents 224 years to run up $1 trillion of foreign held debt. In only 5 years, President Bush has more than doubled that amount.

Contrast this with the last 3 years of the Clinton administration, where we

paid off more than $200 billion in debt to foreign countries.

These staggering figures represent a great burden for future generations who will have to pay the bill. They also keep interest rates high, limit economic growth, and slow job creation.

This President has the worst record of private sector job growth since Herbert Hoover. And the jobs that are created are largely minimum wage and temporary work. Americans are working harder, for less money. Average household income for working families decreased by $1,669 between 2000 and 2005, when adjusted for inflation.

By almost every indicator, American families are facing tough times: Housing affordability, a big problem in California, is at a 14-year low; Health care costs are up 50 percent since 2000; Gas prices are up 60 percent; College costs at public universities are up 57 percent; 45 million people are going without health care, including 6.6 million in California; and 37 million Americans are living in poverty, a number that has increased each year under this administration, U.S. Census Bureau.

You'd think that this budget would attempt to provide relief for most Americans. Instead middle-class families are asked to do more with less.

At the same time, the President is proposing to make tax breaks permanent for the wealthiest Americans—at a cost of $1.3 trillion over the next decade. And, when you combine the cost of the tax cuts with costs of war in Iraq—currently totaling $370 billion—the inevitable result is that critical domestic programs are squeezed.

The budget before the Senate today reflects these constraints by: Cutting food stamps, by $272 million; Cutting food assistance for seniors and children, by $111 million; Reducing the effectiveness of our police officers in cutting COPS by more than $407 million, 15,000 officers nationwide; Cutting $244 million from firefighter grants; Failing to reimburse state and local governments for the Federal responsibilities in paying for the incarceration of illegal immigrants; Cutting funding for 18 of the 19 National Institutes of Health, including those conducting research on cancer and heart disease; And, No Child Left Behind, the President's signature education program, would be underfunded this year by more than $15 billion and $55.78 billion since it was enacted.

These are vital priorities that must be funded.

Because of record federal deficits and debt, money that could have been available for education, healthcare, defense, infrastructure, job development, and homeland security, must now go to interest payments.

In 2006, interest costs alone on the national debt will total nearly $400 billion. And, this figure will grow to nearly $600 billion over the next 5 years. Total non-defense discretionary spending—$416 billion in this budget—is only modestly larger than this interest payment.

This could have been prevented.

The Congressional Budget Office estimated that last year, economic problems caused only about 8 percent of the deficit. The rest resulted from policy choices by Congress and this administration—largely tax cuts for the wealthiest among us.

The time has come to chart a different course, and make the tough choices that the President and this resolution avoid.

We must adopt a balanced approach to both taxes and spending and return to a program of fiscal sanity.

When I first came to the Senate, over a decade ago, a small, bipartisan group decided to get our fiscal house in order. Democrats worked to bring spending under control. And Republicans pledged not to push for additional tax cuts.

I have no problem holding the line on spending, but believe that it must be done in the context of a more responsible approach to tax policy.

We must consider rolling back the tax cut for the wealthiest Americans, to bring the income tax rate from its current 35 percent back to 38.6 percent.

This will affect those earning more than $312,000 per year—less than one percent of taxpayers—but will save nearly $130 billion over the next decade.

Finally, we need to work together to begin addressing some of the deeper structural problems with Social Security and Medicare—before these programs fall into crisis.

These are not easy answers. But, we must change the direction in which this nation is moving. We cannot afford to continue down this path of fiscal irresponsibility. Americans work hard to balance their checkbooks and live within their budgets. They deserve a Government willing to do the same.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I cannot support this budget resolution. It closely mirrors the President's budget which projects the largest deficit in history for 2006 $423 billion. We are on an unsustainable path. We cannot continue year after year to pass budget resolutions that increase the deficit, rather than put us on a course of fiscal responsibility.

Not only should we be concerned about growing deficits, we should be concerned about the debt. Under this budget, the deficit will increase to $371 billion for 2006, and the debt will increase by $654 billion a year. The Senate has just passed a $781 billion increase in the debt ceiling, the fourth largest debt limit increase in our Nation's history. This is the fourth time that the Bush administration has requested an increase in the debt. These increases now total $3 trillion.

The service on the debt alone for this year is $220 billion. This money could be put to better use. With the approaching retirement of the baby boomers, we should not be increasing the debt.

The budget being debated today is not based in reality. It leaves out the full 10 year numbers. Without these numbers, the budget hides the full cost of making the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts permanent. The budget does not include funding for the ongoing war costs beyond 2007. Relief from the individual alternative minimum tax, AMT, is only addressed for 2006. It does not include the President's Social Security privatization proposal.

This budget is incomplete. If the missing items were added back, the debt would increase every year by more than $600 billion. The deficit and debt will continue to explode because the budget will continue a course of spending more than the amount of revenue raised.

It is not right to vote on budget that is incomplete. In his budget, the President only chose to address the AMT for 1 year—2006—and chose not to address it for the current budget year. The administration's budget deliberately leaves out a more permanent solution for the AMT for two reasons: first, the AMT would add additional costs to the budget; and second, the AMT masks the true costs of the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts.

This budget resolution follows the administration's lead. It chooses to only address the AMT for 2006 and to extend tax provisions that do not expire until the end of 2010. The budget does not address the 23 million families that will be impacted by the AMT in 2007, but the budget makes sure that the tax cuts that are skewed to those making more than $1 million are extended through 2011.

This budget continues the repeated pattern of choosing tax cuts for the wealthy rather than investing in our future. The tax cuts going to those who on average earn over $1 million a year cost $41 billion for a single year. In contrast, the President's budget cuts education by $2.2 billion—the biggest cut ever for education. This budget shortchanges veterans. There are reductions in law enforcement, firefighter grants, and essential air services. These are just a few of the many examples how the budget's priorities are misguided.

The budget does not adequately address healthcare. Access to quality, affordable health care continues to be a challenge for most Americans and the Bush budget only exacerbates the problems. And what about the uninsured? There is nothing in this budget to help them. Sure, there are some recycled, stale proposals the administration has been trying to advance for 5 years now but nothing really new. Nothing that will help any families gain access to coverage that is quality, affordable, comprehensive care. It's high time we have a real debate and discussion in the Congress on real reforms necessary to address the health needs of our nation.

The budget resolution assumes the deep cuts and unprecedented fees for the Small Business Administration, SBA. The administration's request of

$624 million is insufficient to meet the needs of small businesses in this country that need access to capital, counseling and Federal contracts. By the SBA's own calculation, the request is $18 million less than what was available to the Agency last year when congressional initiatives and disaster supplemental appropriations are excluded.

I proposed an amendment to increase the funding shortfall by $151 million and it was offset by closing abusive corporate tax loopholes. Unfortunately, this amendment did not garner bipartisan support. However, we were able to reach a bipartisan agreement that would increase SBA funding by $130 million.

This budget is another example of how the Republican controlled Congress continues to misuse the reconciliation process. The reconciliation process was designed to make it easier to pass difficult legislation that would provide fiscal discipline. It is now being used to ram through tax cuts and pet priorities that do not have the support of 60 Senators.

I am vigorously opposed to the inclusion in the budget of assumed revenues and a reconciliation instruction for the Energy and Natural Resources Committee linked to opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil and gas leasing and development. I object to the inclusion of drilling in the refuge for two primary reasons. First, it is irresponsible to base our budget on the highly speculative projection of lease revenues from the Coastal Plain. Second, I oppose using the reconciliation process to open the Arctic Refuge to drilling because it would limit consideration of this highly controversial issue.

The reconciliation process is being used to address only one Senate committee's jurisdiction, and is clearly intended to authorize oil and gas leasing in the Arctic Refuge. This underscores that the real objective of the process is not deficit reduction, but rather to circumvent normal Senate process and procedure with respect to this controversial subject.

On the whole this budget reflects no new ideas and recycles bad policies. This budget fails to address reality, and I therefore cannot support it.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, today, I filed an amendment that would increase funding for basic research at the National Institutes of Health, and restore cuts made under the President's budget to critical R&D programs. It would have been fully offset by closing tax loopholes. But I faced opposition from my Republican colleagues and it was not accepted.

This budget and the President's American Competitiveness Initiative make no new serious commitments to invest in R&D. The President would have you believe that he is increasing our investment in R&D when it barely keeps pace with projected inflation. To fund the increases at the National Science Foundation and other increases, every other R&D agency will see real cuts for the next 5 years. It just creates winners and losers.

In fact, this budget keeps our R&D investment stagnant—it has already flat-lined at 1.1 percent of our GDP.

If America is going to compete and win in the global economy, we must innovate and support basic research in all areas. We want the new inventions and new technologies and new cures to be made in the U.S.A. And that means supporting the basic research that is the foundation of new discoveries that will create the good jobs of the future.

But this budget cuts funding for basic research. The National Academy of Sciences, the Council on Competitiveness, and Nobel prize winners like American physicist Steven Chu say that is wrong for America's future.

When Dr. Chu testified before the Senate last year, he said ''There are growing signs that all is not well . . . We call for an increased federal investment in long-term, basic research.''

The Internet, the laser, MRIs, and the mapping of the human genome all came about from basic research at DOD, NIH, and other Federal agencies. Think of the millions of jobs that these innovations have created.

I intend to continue my efforts in the Senate to ensure that American innovation will continue. It is critical to our growth and our future competitiveness.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss my amendment to the fiscal year 2007 budget resolution, which would have provided immediately for a $4,500 Pell grant for needy students. My amendment would have redirected the savings generated by the HELP Committee as part of reconciliation back to student aid, as originally intended and passed by the committee and the full Senate.

Last year, through Chairman ENZI's leadership, the HELP Committee drafted a bipartisan Higher Education Act reauthorization and reconciliation instructions. The committee was instructed to find savings of $13.7 billion—$7 billion of which was to be generated from education programs. The committee developed reconciliation instructions that included savings of over $20 billion. As a member of the HELP Committee, I can say that we purposely generated additional savings with the intent that a portion of the savings would be returned to students in the form of grant aid.

Accordingly, the committee created two programs for Pell-eligible students. We allocated $2.25 billion for SMART grants to target aid to students who study math, science or a critical foreign language. We also allocated $6 billion to the Provisional Grant Assistance Program, or ProGAP. These increases in the Pell grant program are critical, given that tuition has increased rapidly.

This year alone, tuition rose by 7.1 percent at public colleges and 5.9 percent at private universities. Yet students and families have seen no growth in the Pell grant program in the past 4 years; the maximum Pell award has been stagnant at $4,050 since fiscal year 2003. ProGAP would have immediately provided current Pell recipients with a $4,500 maximum grant.

However, when the Deficit Reduction Act returned to the Senate from conference with the House, ProGAP had been eliminated and was replaced by Academic Competitiveness grants. The majority will claim to have increased grant aid for needy students through Academic Competitiveness and SMART grants.

However, the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that less than 10 percent of Pell-eligible students will be able to take advantage of the Academic Competitiveness and SMART grants in 2006. The percent of eligible students rises slowly, from 10.3 percent in 2007 to a paltry 13.5 percent in 2010. Given the existence of both Academic Competitiveness and SMART grants in the conference bill, adopting my amendment would have allowed us to help both needy Pell students and target math and science programs.

The intention of the committee was for the savings generated from changes to the student loan programs go towards deficit reduction and student aid. Not only did the final bill significantly reduce the aid going to students, the savings are clearly going for tax cuts that will not help the families we sought to help in the bill we passed in the Senate. In fact, even with the savings generated through the Deficit Reduction Act, the tax cuts cost more than the savings we generated. The newest tax cuts yet again result in an increase to the deficit.

Currently only one-third of the U.S. workforce has a postsecondary education, but it is estimated that 60 percent of new jobs in the 21st century will require a college education. Workers who have attended college on average have higher incomes and lower rates of unemployment than those who don't. And those with a college education also are more likely to have jobs with benefits like health care, retirement and pensions plans.

My amendment would have restored our original intent of the Senate by redirecting the savings generated by the HELP Committee into the pockets of needy students, not the pockets of the wealthy benefiting from the tax cuts.

Mr. President, I withdrew my amendment after we had a huge victory for education—the overwhelming passage of the Specter-Harkin amendment which would provide $7 billion in increased funding to health and education programs. As an appropriator, I know first hand how critical that funding will be for education programs in fiscal year 2007. But we must all fight to retain that funding when the budget resolution is conferenced with the House. We should not accept a final budget resolution that does not contain the funding provided through the Specter-Harkin amendment.

While I withdrew my amendment today, I will continue to fight for increasing Pell grants and student aid. We can do better than level funding for our nation's needy college students.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, as many of you know, I am co-chair of the Senate Rural Health Caucus and have worked on rural hospital and provider equity issues for a long time. Of course, the Senate does not always agree on every issue especially when it comes to health care. Over the years, however, the Rural Health Caucus has proved to be a bipartisan forum for Members on both sides of the aisle to come together and work on real solutions to help rural Americans have access to the same affordable, quality health care services as folks living in urban areas.

There are now over 80 members of the Rural Health Caucus, and together we remain committed to making sure the unique health care needs of rural and frontier areas are met. We all shared the success of passing landmark rural Medicare equity provisions in the Medicare Modernization Act of 2003. This legislation included the most comprehensive attempt to put rural providers on a level playing field with their urban counterparts. Clearly, this was a significant victory, but there is much more still to do.

As most of you know, the President's fiscal year 2007 budget eliminated or severely reduced several effective and efficient rural health programs. Now, I have long believed that we need to hold Federal agencies and programs accountable for the taxpayer dollars they spend. I also believe the Federal Government cannot be all things to all people. Congress must take the necessary, and often difficult, steps to ensure we put this country on a solid path toward reducing the deficit. Of course, we all have different ideas on how to achieve that goal. I agree with Chairman GREGG that we can start by slowing—and in some cases—eliminating wasteful spending. The budget before us focuses, primarily, on cutting spending and encouraging growth. If programs are not meeting their intended purpose, or are not performing well, then it is fair to look at eliminating the program. Many of the programs Congress funds are duplicative in nature. We have a responsibility to identify reasonable ways to root out waste, streamline program creating and spending, and manage our limited resources so that we can serve folks better.

While it is important to identify and eliminate wasteful and inefficient programs, I also believe that we must support government policies that work. Rural health care programs operate on a shoestring budget. Current spending for all rural health discretionary programs is relatively small, but it plays a critical role in solidifying the fragile health care infrastructure common in rural communities. There are several important rural health programs such as: rural hospital flexibility grants, rural outreach program, trauma care, small hospital improvement program, health professions training, and rural access to emergency devices which all play a key role in delivering services to our medically underserved rural areas. The importance of these programs should not be undervalued. They meet our unique rural health needs by improving emergency medical service networks, developing chronic disease management programs, implementing quality improvement initiatives, and helping small rural hospitals unable to keep their doors open convert to Critical Access Hospital, CAH, status.

In Wyoming, rural health programs have made a real difference in the quality, access, and affordability of care available in our frontier communities. That is why I am extremely pleased to see the budget before us today assumes a $235 million increase for the Health Resources and Services Administration, HRSA, over the President's request. Chairman GREGG's mark clearly states this $235 million increase is primarily intended to support rural health programs. I want to take this opportunity to thank Chairman GREGG for his hard work and support of this important issue. These increases will go a long way toward helping rural hospitals and providers deliver essential health care services to many remote and medically underserved areas.

I also want to especially thank my colleague from North Dakota, Senator CONRAD, for consistently partnering with me to ensure fair and equitable rural health treatment in the budget process.

I now look forward to working with all members of the Senate Rural Health Caucus as we fight to ensure adequate funding for rural health programs during the fiscal year 2007 appropriations process.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today with my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Oregon, to speak out against the administration's proposal to fund the Secure Rural Schools Program with a fire sale of our public land. It is vital to rural Montana and rural America that we reauthorize and fully fund the Secure Rural Schools Program, but we should not do it by putting a ''for sale'' sign on our prime hunting and fishing lands.

The administration's padlock proposal to sell public lands to reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools Program sells rural America short. Montana and Oregon like many other States are outdoors States. We hunt. We fish. We take our kids hiking and camping. Our public lands are part of our recreational heritage as Americans. We should be increasing access for hunters and anglers, not putting more padlocks on more gates.

The administration's land grab proposal is bad for sportsmen, an it is bad for our schools. Back in 2000, I was proud to be a cosponsor of Senator WYDEN and Senator CRAIG's secure rural schools bill. The Secure Rural Schools Act has given counties more money, more certainty, and more flexibility. I would call that a pretty good solution. We should not be abandoning 6 years of success. It is vital to our rural communities that we reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools Act, and I will fight tooth and nail with Senator WYDEN to protect our public lands, reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools Act, and stop the administration's misguided land grab.

Mr. WYDEN, Mr. President, I am in full agreement with my friend and colleague from Montana. The idea to sell public lands to fund the secure rural schools reauthorization is a fundamentally flawed one. It pushes the debate over public lands and forestry back into the political briar patch despite the power of the legislation to bring traditional enemies together all across rural America in over 40 States and over 700 counties. It is because of the good work by my friend from Montana that this faulty idea is not assumed as part of this budget we debate today.

As Senator BAUCUS and I continue our exhaustive search in the next weeks for offsets to pay for the reauthorization of the county payments legislation, he and I will continue our work to defeat the ill-conceived and divisive idea of selling off public lands to pay for the continuation of such a collaborative and locally successful program. From his position as the ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee, on which I am privileged to serve with him, I feel sure that he will come up with the winning solution to offset the costs of reauthorizing this vital national program.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, last year when the Senate was considering the national intelligence reform bill, we adopted several recommendations of the 9/11 Commission.

One of those recommendations was to hire an additional 2,000 new Custom and border protection agents each year for the next 5 years. This body agreed with the recommendation. We agreed that our national security depended on such an investment, and we enacted that recommendation into law.

We are now considering a budget resolution that will determine whether Congress will keep the promise we made to the American people to protect our Nation's borders. There are many provisions in this budget that demonstrate a commitment to border security. I thank and congratulate Chairman Gregg for those provisions. But the budget that was reported out of committee includes funding for only 1,500 new agents in the coming year.

My amendment would provide $153 million to ensure that we hire 2,000 new agents next year. This amendment is fully offset. Let's face it—the threat of illegal border crossing by people who wish to kill us is very real. In order to prevent another terrorist attack on American soil, we must improve every aspect of our Nation's security. Our security is truly only as strong as our weakest link.

For too long, the lack of funding for border agents has been a weak link. By funding additional agents, we protect both our southern and our often neglected northern border. This will make it harder for terrorists to enter the United States and attack us.

There have been several news reports recently that I want to bring to my colleagues' attention.

Last year, intelligence officials confirmed that the terrorist, Zarqawi, plans to infiltrate America through our borders. He plans to attack targets such as movie theaters, restaurants, and schools. My amendment commits the resources to make sure that this does not happen.

Just last summer, in Detroit, a Lebanese national named Mahmoud Youssef Kourani, who was in the United States illegally, pled guilty in Federal court to conspiring to raise money for a recognized terrorist group. He was in the United States raising money to fund terrorists. That is outrageous. But what is equally outrageous is how he came into the United States in the first place.

Kourani took advantage of our porous border. Kourani paid a Mexican consular official in Beirut $3,000 for a visa to enter Mexico. Once in Mexico, he snuck across the U.S.-Mexican border in 2001 and settled in Michigan.

According to Federal prosecutors, Kourani and another member of his family are heavily involved with the same group that killed 214 marines in Beirut in 1983 and which is also responsible for bombing two U.S. Embassies.

While in the United States, Kourani also helped harbor other illegal immigrants. Thankfully, he was prosecuted before he could inflict any direct harm on any American.

Given how easy it is for people like Kourani to enter the United States, I believe that my amendment is imperative to our national security.

My amendment does not require any additional spending. It is completely offset. This amendment is paid for.

Homeland Security spending must be based on priorities. The fact that terrorists would use our borders to gain access to the United States to attack us is a real threat. So we must provide funds for Customs and border protection.

Four and a half years ago it only took 19 to change the course of this country. We must do everything that we can to prevent another terrorist attack on American soil.

The world has changed dramatically since 9/11 when the terrorists used our open and trusting society against us. We can not allow a repeat of that tragedy.

This amendment will help those who guard our frontiers by providing the necessary, and I stress necessary, tools to ensure the safety of our citizens.

I urge my colleagues to adopt my amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, as we continue to debate the budget resolution, I wanted to raise an important issue with my colleagues. The budget for fiscal year 2007 that was proposed by the administration would discontinue all activities of the National Children's Study or NCS.

This important study which was authorized as part of the Children's Health Act of 2000, provides for the development and implementation of the largest longitudinal study of children ever conducted in the United States. The goal of the study is to improve the health and well-being of children. The information from this study will be used to determine and affect the major causes of childhood illness such as premature birth, asthma, obesity, preventable injury, autism, developmental delay, mental illness, and learning disorders.

These disorders, among many other high-frequency diseases that afflict children, result from the interaction of multiple biologic, genetic, chemical, social and behavioral factors that combine to determine health. Researchers will analyze how these elements interact with each other and what helpful and/or harmful effects they might have on children's health. By studying children through their different phases of growth and development, researchers will be better able to understand the role of these factors on health and disease.

The National Children's Study will follow a representative sample of America's children in order to identify causes and develop treatments of specific diseases, and develop population-based intervention strategies to prevent illness and ameliorate the impacts of poverty and substandard environments on children's growth, development, and mental health. This will include approximately 100,000 children from over 100 locations throughout the United States.

Since 2000, over 50 million has been spent planning the study. Over 2,500 scientists and community members from across the country have developed a study plan that defines research question, hypotheses, and critical exposure and outcome measures beginning before pregnancy and continuing throughout the life cycle of children. In 2005, the Study designated seven Vanguard pilot centers throughout the United States, including sites in California, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Utah, and Wisconsin to begin the study with over 100 additional sites planned across the Nation.

It is unfortunate that funding for the study was zeroed out the President's budget and would be extremely shortsighted to put off this study. While there are upfront costs to conduct a study of this size, they are dwarfed by the cost of treating the diseases and conditions it can be expected to address. The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, NICHD estimates that the major chronic diseases the study will address directly cost American $269 billion per year. If the study were to result in only a 1 percent reduction in those costs, the expense of the entire 20-plus year study could be recouped in a single year.

The environment in which our children grow up has changed significantly over the past 50 years, resulting in increases in rates of diseases such as asthma, obesity, and learning and other developmental disabilities. In order to overcome these challenges, we need to invest in the National Children's Study, in addition to other research efforts to improve our understanding of how to prevent disease and improve the environments in which our children live.

As a parent of three children, and now a grandparent of three, I know how important it is to provide a healthy environment for our youth. I hope the future will be brighter for future generations, and one way we can make that happen is by finding the answers to many health questions that plague us today. The National Children's Study will be one of the richest information resources available to children's health and development and will form the basis of child health guidance, interventions, and policy for generations to come.

It is my hope that this body will do all it can to restore the cuts to the NCS and keep this critical work moving forward, and I will work with my colleagues through the Appropriations Committee to make that happen.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, my amendment No. 3154 to the budget resolution would restore much-needed funding to the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Program. The administration's budget slashes this program by $20 million, which amounts to a 63-percent cut to a program that helps save the lives of law enforcement officers nationwide by providing State and local law enforcement agencies with the resources to help buy body armor for their officers.

My amendment supports the allocation of $41 million in funding for bulletproof vest partnership grants to fully fund it at the authorized level of $50 million in fiscal year 2007. The increase in funds is offset by discretionary spending reductions.

Our former colleague Senator Campbell and I authored the Bulletproof Vest Grant Partnership Act of 1998 in response to the tragic Carl Drega shootout in 1997 on the Vermont-New Hampshire border, in which two State troopers who lacked bulletproof vests were killed. The federal officers who responded to the scenes of the shooting spree were equipped with life-saving body armor, but the State and local law enforcement officers lacked protective vests because of the cost.

We have successfully reauthorized this program three more times: in the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 2000, in the State Justice Institute Reauthorization Act of 2004, and

most recently as part of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005. It is now authorized at $50 million per year through fiscal year 2009.

Year after year, the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Program saves the lives and spares injuries of law enforcement officers nationwide by providing more help to State and local law enforcement agencies to purchase body armor. Since its inception in 1999, this highly successful DOJ program has provided law enforcement officers in 16,000 jurisdictions nationwide with nearly 350,000 new bulletproof vests. In Vermont, more than 150 municipalities have used this partnership help to purchase 1,400 vests. Without the assistance this program offers, I daresay there would be close to that number of police officers without vests in Vermont today.

Compounding the ongoing funding needs to help purchase vests, concerns from the law enforcement community over the effectiveness of body armor surfaced nearly 2 years ago when a Pennsylvania police officer was shot and critically wounded through his relatively new Zylon-based body armor vest. In August 2005, the Justice Department announced that test results indicated that used Zylon-based vests may not provide the intended level of ballistic resistance. Unfortunately, an estimated 200,000 of these faulty vests have been purchased—many with vest partnership funds—and now need to be replaced.

We know that body armor saves lives, but the cost has put these vests out of the reach of many of the officers who need them. This program makes it more affordable for police departments of all sizes. Few things mean more to me than when I meet Vermont police officers and they tell me that the protective vests they wear were made possible because of this program. This is the least we should do for the officers on the front lines who put themselves in danger for us every day.

I want to make sure that every police officer who needs a bulletproof vest gets one. If the Senate approves this amendment to fully fund this program at $50 million, then we will be on our way to helping ease the burden faced by officers and their families and to further our mission to provide every police officer who needs a safe vest with the means to purchase one.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, as a member of the Budget Committee, I am deeply disappointed that the budget we are considering and the one proposed by the President last month will make finding adequate funding for so many of our Nation's domestic priorities exceedingly hard to achieve.

Budgets are about priorities—hard-working South Dakota families know that because they have to make priorities in their family budget every day. Unfortunately, the President and the Republican leadership in Congress fail to make investments in key programs that assist average, hard-working Americans.

Federal education mandates are woefully underfunded. Yet the President's budget proposed the largest cut to Federal education funding in the Department of Education's 26-year history. Further, for the second year in a row, the administration proposed a 5-percent across-the-board cut to crop and dairy payments for producers. As well, the President's budget included $16.9 billion in cuts to Medicaid and about $35 billion in cuts to Medicare over 5 years. While I am pleased the Senate budget resolution does not contain all of the President's budget cuts, we cannot continue to try to balance the budget on the backs of students, farmers and ranchers, and seniors.

While the administration is advocating cuts to important domestic programs, it is estimated that the cost of the Bush tax cuts for those making over $1 million annually will be more than $41 billion in fiscal year 2007 alone.

Despite what the leadership likes to say about their budget, this is not a fiscally responsible budget. I think it is time we put our Nation's finances back in order. This budget assumes that the deficit for fiscal year 2007 will be $359 billion, and decline to $177 billion in fiscal year 2011. However, these assumptions omit items like the cost of extending expiring tax cuts, fixing the alternative minimum tax, AMT, the ongoing war costs, and the spending of the Social Security and other trust funds. When these costs are included, the Nation's debt will increase by more than $600 billion every year over the next 5 years.

To put this in perspective, consider how much U.S. debt is held by foreigners. It took 224 years and 42 Presidents—all of our Presidents from Washington to Clinton—to have $1 trillion in debt held outside our country. In just 5 years, that foreign debt level has more than doubled.

I believe one of the best ways we can restore fiscal responsibility is to reinstate the pay-as-you-go rules that were in effect from 1991 to 2000. The pay-go rule simply means that if you want additional mandatory spending or tax cuts, you have to pay for them by offsets or obtain a supermajority vote to pass them. Unfortunately, the Senate failed to adopt a pay-go rule to the budget resolution yesterday on a tie vote of 50–50.

Instead, we are being asked to support a budget that I don't think reflects the values and priorities of a majority of South Dakota families, and does not restore fiscal responsibility. I will continue working in a bipartisan manner to make improvements in the fiscal year 2007 budget and restoring our Nation's fiscal strength.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, as we debate the Senate budget resolution for fiscal year 2007 and the bill before us now to raise the debt ceiling, I want to talk for a moment about the broader issue of fiscal responsibility and honesty.

We are about to significantly raise the limit on our national debt for the fourth time in the past 5 years, this time to nearly $9 trillion. With deficits as far as the eye can see, we are on an unsustainable budgetary path that threatens not only to severely restrict our Government's ability to provide critical services but to cause irreparable damage both to our economy and our influence in the world community.

Alan Greenspan articulated our situation clearly in his last months as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. Mr. Greenspan said, ''our budget position will substantially worsen in the coming years unless major deficit-reducing actions are taken . . . crafting a budget strategy that meets the nation's longer-run needs will become more difficult the more we delay.''

Even more troubling, our deficits are worse than they seem. While the Congressional Budget Office has estimated the size of this year's deficit at $371 billion, that figure does not account for the tens of billions of dollars of emergency supplemental spending that we can all anticipate to address needs in Iraq and Afghanistan. It also does not include the $180 billion we are raiding from the Social Security trust fund, nor does it take into account the interest we will need to pay on the additional debt. As Senator CONRAD has pointed out, we anticipate the national debt will increase by $654 billion this year.

Six years ago, we were running a budget surplus. While the national debt was $5 trillion, for the first time in almost 20 years, we found ourselves in a position where we could start to pay off some of that debt. We knew we would soon face the demographic pressures associated with the retirement of the baby boom generation, but we had the resources at our disposal to begin preparing for those pressures.

Now, just 6 years later, the circumstances that gave us a reason to be optimistic have all but dissolved in a sea of irresponsible fiscal policies, dishonest accounting, and partisan opportunism.

To be sure, not everything that brought us to this point was within our control. The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, shook our economy, gave rise to new and unexpected costs, and rightly caused us to shift our national focus to the threat of international terrorism—sometimes, unavoidably, to the detriment of our ability to sufficiently focus on our looming fiscal challenges.

Having said that, much of what led to our current crisis was within our control. The fairness of the multiple tax cuts that Congress passed in the last 5 years was certainly within our control.

Whether or not those tax cuts were paid for was certainly within our control.

And whether or not we are honest about including the costs of the ongoing military efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan, the need to provide continuing relief for middle-class families from the alternative minimum tax, and the inevitable costs associated with any proposal to address the problems faced by our entitlement programs is certainly within our control.

We must be more responsible and more realistic.

First, we must begin working today to prepare for the retirement of the baby boomers. While the situation is not as dire as some would have us believe, the Social Security system cannot support itself in its current form forever. We need to make tough decisions in order to restore that program to a path of solvency.

In addition, with health care costs skyrocketing, we need to take a hard look at Medicare and Medicaid in order to ensure they can continue to provide high-quality care for the elderly and the poor. Again, the problems associated with these programs will only grow with the retirement of the baby boom generation, and we need to act now to avert a full-fledged fiscal disaster.

Second, we must be more realistic about aligning our tax policies with our spending policies. American families understand the simple fact that you cannot spend more than you take in. Yet this fact seems to escape this administration and the current congressional leadership. Year after year, we see massive spending reductions in vital programs followed up by even bigger tax cuts.

Contrary to what some seem to believe, the tax cuts of the past 5 years are not going to pay for themselves. While I support many of those tax cuts— particularly those that benefit middle-class families—it is undeniable that they have resulted in lower revenue for the Federal Government and will continue to do so in the long run. This is especially in light of the fact that they were not paid for and will therefore add to the national debt and increase the associated interest costs.

Third, we cannot afford to be dishonest about costs we know we will face. The President's budget contained no funding for the military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan beyond next year. Yet the Congressional Budget Office has said we should expect to pay $312 billion in war-related costs for the period between 2007 and 2016.

Furthermore, we know we will need to provide relief from the alternative minimum tax for middle-class families. The Senate recently passed legislation that would contain a 1-year fix of the AMT at the price tag of $30 billion. The cost of providing AMT relief for the next decade is estimated at $1 trillion. Yet neither the President's budget request nor the proposal before the Senate includes the cost of providing any AMT relief beyond this year.

And this is to say nothing of how costly it would be to make permanent the President's 2001 tax cuts, which is something we all know he will try to do. A recent estimate by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities indicated that the cost of extending the President's tax cuts through 2016 would be nearly $2 trillion.

This debate is as much about honesty as it is about crunching numbers. How can we expect to be adequately prepared for the looming influx of Americans into the Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid programs if we are not honest about costs we know we will have to deal with—and not just over the long term but this year?

Yet another troubling symptom of our current misguided policies is the growing percentage of our debt that is being purchased by foreign investors. As Senator CONRAD has repeatedly pointed out in recent weeks, the level of debt purchased by foreign investors under President Bush is more than twice the amount purchased by foreign investors under the previous 42 Presidents combined. Foreign investors—whether it be the central banks of foreign countries or private investors—now own nearly half of all publicly issued U.S. debt.

I was astounded by the following statistics. According to the Economic Policy Institute, if foreign lenders keep buying U.S. debt at their current rate, the Federal Government will owe $3.8 trillion to foreign lenders by 2011, an amount equivalent to 23 percent of expected gross domestic product for that year. We will owe those lenders $181 billion in interest alone.

To provide some context, that amount is 2½ times the size of the entire fiscal year 2007 budget for the Department of Veterans' Affairs.

I realize that we cannot fix all of these problems this week, or even this year. But we can start to bring some sense to our Nation's fiscal priorities by going on record in support of our most critical programs and by embracing fiscal responsibility.

It is why I have consistently cosponsored classic pay-go proposals, which aim to ensure that both spending increases and tax cuts are fully paid for.

There is much more that is wrong with the Government's fiscal practices and priorities than what I have discussed today. Among other things, I do not believe that our budget goes far enough in supporting rural America; I do not believe it does enough to provide resources to State and local law enforcement; and I do not believe it does enough to promote community development.

More than anything, however, the debate on the Senate floor this week is about our broader priorities as a nation. It is about whether we value candor and responsibility over partisan opportunism. If we do not act soon to reverse our direction, we will have made our decision, and it will have been the wrong one.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Humphrey Hawkins Act of 1978 specifies that time should be set aside in the consideration of the budget resolution for debate on economic goals and policies. As the ranking member of the Joint Economic Committee, I rise today to talk about how the budget submitted by President Bush and the version of that budget which we are debating this week in the Senate embody the wrong goals and policies to address the challenges facing the American economy.

If you listen to the President and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, you would get the impression that the economy is in good shape and that their policies have been successful. But if you listen to the American people you know that there is considerable anxiety about the economy and considerable disapproval about how the other side has managed economic policy.

The American people are right. All is not well with the Bush economy and the President's economic policies. President Bush likes to cite statistics on how fast the economy is growing and how much productivity—the output a worker produces in an hour—has increased. What he doesn't mention is that on his watch the economy went through the most protracted jobs slump in decades; that there is still considerable evidence of lagging labor force participation and hidden unemployment; and that the benefits of productivity growth have been showing up in the bottom lines of companies rather than in the paychecks of workers.

The President doesn't mention that disparities in wages and incomes are growing wider. Those who are already well-to-do are continuing to do very well. But the typical American family is struggling to make ends meet in the face of rising costs for energy, health care, and a college education for their children.

The administration and its supporters will not take responsibility for the failure of their policies. They say that their tax cuts are working and that all the American economy needs is more tax cuts. But the Bush tax cuts have not created an economy that works for ordinary Americans and they have mortgaged our future. Responsible analysts have shown that the President's tax cuts for the rich were poorly designed for generating jobs and putting people back to work in the wake of the 2001 recession. They had very low ''bang-for-the-buck'' in terms of job stimulus in the short run, but they were so massive that they created a legacy of large budget deficits and mounting debt that will be a drag on the economy in the long run.

President Bush has squandered the hard-won fiscal discipline achieved in the 1990s. He inherited a 10-year budget surplus of $5.6 trillion and turned it into a stream of deficits.

This year's budget gives the illusion that we will be making substantial progress in reducing the deficit over the next few years. But that is not

what responsible analysts say. They point out that a realistic budget assessment shows continuing structural deficits over the next several years and a potential explosion of the deficit once the costs of the baby-boom generation's retirement kick in fully.

With a $5.6 trillion 10-year budget surplus now a deficit of at least $2.7 trillion, this administration has turned us into a nation of debtors, relying on the rest of the world to finance our budget deficits and the rest of our excessive spending. Yesterday we learned that the current account deficit—the broadest measure of our international payments imbalance—was $805 billion last year, an amount equal to 6.4 percent of GDP. That is a record both in dollar terms and as a share of GDP.

The ballooning international trade and budget deficits dramatize the misplaced fiscal priorities of the President and the Republican Congress. The administration's large Federal budget deficits and mounting Federal debt are putting enormous pressure on the trade deficit and the dollar. We are mortgaging our future to foreign investors and foreign governments instead of getting our fiscal house in order and boosting our own national saving.

And we are not investing in people here at home the way we should be. A new analysis of the President's budget by the Democratic staff of the Joint Economic Committee shows that the President's policies would add to the deficit and reduce investments that aid moderate- and lower-income families in order to pay part of the cost of tax cuts going disproportionately to those with very high incomes.

The JEC Democratic staff analysis shows that the burden of cuts in those programs that provide benefits to individuals would be borne disproportionately by families in the bottom 40 percent of the income distribution. The share of spending cuts borne by those families would be disproportionate to their share of aggregate family income and to the share of any benefits they could expect to receive from the President's proposed tax cuts.

Families in the bottom 20 percent of the income distribution would absorb 32 percent of the cuts in payments for individuals, even though their share of aggregate family income is only 3 percent. Families in the next lowest fifth of the income distribution, with 8 percent of aggregate family income, would bear 23 percent of the budget cuts in payments for individuals.

Disparities in the impact of the President's budget proposals on families in different parts of the income distribution are even more pronounced when the tax cuts are taken into account. Families in the bottom 40 percent of the income distribution would receive only 6 percent of the benefits from tax cuts while bearing over half the burden of the spending cuts. In contrast, families in the top 20 percent of the income distribution would receive over 70 percent of the benefits of the tax cuts while bearing only 14 percent of the burden of the spending cuts.

The net impact of those cuts would leave families at the bottom of the income distribution shouldering nearly all of the pain while families at the top of the income distribution would reap nearly all of the net benefits.

A budget resolution that echoes the President's budget neither meets the pressing needs of the American people nor addresses the long-term challenges that lie ahead. Clearly, we're in for another year of policies that do little to help the average family or bring down the deficit.

A long-term budget and economic disaster looms if we don't restore fiscal discipline. The President's large and growing Federal budget deficits leave us increasingly hampered in our ability to deal with the host of challenges we face. We need policies that address the problems facing the country's most disadvantaged citizens and help ordinary working families deal with job and retirement insecurity and the rising costs of energy, health care, and education for their children.

We can and should do better.

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the budget resolution.

A budget is about choices. It is about tradeoffs. It is about weighing competing priorities and conflicting objectives and figuring out what matters most for Americans.

Unfortunately, the budget we have before us makes the wrong choices. Instead of tackling Federal deficits and rising debt, this budget worsens them. Instead of strengthening our schools so America can be competitive in a global economy, this budget weakens them. Instead of taking bold action against poverty as the President promised after Katrina, this budget cuts important services that Americans depend on.

Budgets matter because the tradeoffs we make matter, and this budget makes the wrong tradeoffs. It extends tax breaks aimed at millionaires while doing nothing to expand opportunity for working Americans. It claims to be fiscally responsible while ignoring billions of dollars of Government spending for ongoing military operations overseas.

At a time when we have maxed out our borrowing, this budget has us borrowing more. At a time when we have already cut certain programs beyond the level of efficiency, this budget cuts them some more. At a time when we have already lavished tax breaks on the wealthiest people and corporations, this budget lavishes even more.

As I talk to families in Illinois—farmers and small businesspeople, teachers and veterans, salespeople and service workers, doctors and senior citizens, people prospering and those struggling at the margins—I see people dealing with real issues and real problems. I see people concerned about our national security and our domestic security. I see people worried about what they see and what they don't see happening here in Washington.

Unfortunately, this budget that we are debating today gives Americans little reason to have confidence in their Government. This budget gives them little reason to think that their elected leaders are paying attention.

Many of my Democratic colleagues and I have been offering amendments over the last few days. Together we are troubled by this budget and doing our best to ensure that it reflects at least some of America's cherished values. A few of my Republican colleagues have also joined us in trying to improve this bill.

I was disappointed on Tuesday by the failure of the Senate to pass the Pay-go amendment to restore discipline to our budgeting process. That vote was bipartisan and very close, and I hold out hope that this body will soon restore budget rules that work to reduce deficits and restrain debt. But there are still opportunities to make this resolution more responsive to the needs and concerns of the people in Illinois.

For example, I appreciate the willingness of Senator GREGG and Senator CONRAD, as the managers of this bill, to accept an important amendment of mine that addresses the problem of homeless veterans.

Each and every night, more than 200,000 of our Nation's veterans are homeless. More than 400,000 will experience homelessness over the course of a year. In my hometown of Chicago, as many as 38,000 veterans spend a night homeless over the course of a year.

It is one the great tragedies of this Nation that brave men and women who risked their lives for us have no place to turn to and no place to call home.

There is no single cause for homelessness among veterans. Homeless vets are men and women, single and married. They have served in every conflict since World War II. Many suffer from posttraumatic stress disorder or were physically and mentally battered in combat. A large number left the military without job skills that could be easily transferred to the private sector. Regardless of the cause, we know that there are ways to combat this crisis.

My amendment devotes a small amount to begin addressing this problem by building on existing proven programs. For nearly 20 years, the Homeless Veterans Reintegration Program has helped get veterans off the streets with intensive services that are unavailable elsewhere and really get to the heart of the causes of homelessness.

HVRP grant recipients provide clothing and food to help stabilize veterans, they provide mental health and substance abuse counseling, and they provide employment services and housing assistance to allow them to reenter society. Some HVRP programs even employ formerly homeless veterans to serve as counselors and role models to other veterans. HVRP offers specialized

support for veterans who are turned away from other programs. In short, HVRP is a cost-effective and proven way to help veterans who have no place else to turn.

The budget currently flatlines spending for the HVRP at $22 million, which is only 44 percent of the authorized level. At this amount, we will only be able to serve 16,250 veterans next year.

My amendment increases HVRP to its full authorized amount, an increase of $28 million. This will help us reach approximately 36,820 homeless veterans. This is still less than 10 percent of the total need, but it is an important start. My amendment will also devote an additional $12 million to the Department of Labor to improve jobs services for hard-to-place veterans. This is a modest increase of 6 percent over last year.

Every day, we walk past men and women on street corners with handwritten signs like ''Homeless Veteran—Need Food.'' Sometimes we give a dollar, sometimes we just keep walking. These are soldiers who fought in World War II, Vietnam, and Iraq.

We cannot allow the proud shoulders that have carried the weight of liberty to be broken by the terrible burden of homelessness and hopelessness. We owe our veterans more than an emergency shelter cot or a cardboard box beneath an overpass. We owe them a chance to enjoy the dignity and respect they earned fighting for our freedom.

These men and women served us without fail when we needed them, and now we must do the same for them.

I thank Senators GREGG and CONRAD for accepting this amendment.

Mr. President, I hope we can continue to improve this budget. But, until we have a fiscally responsible budget that makes the right choices for America, I owe it to the people of Illinois to reject it.

I hope it won't be too long before this body can get serious about solving the real problems we face as a country and preparing for the new challenges and opportunities we will face in the years ahead.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I regret that I was unable to vote in support of Senator LIEBERMAN's amendment 3034 to the fiscal year 2007 congressional budget resolution. It is critically important to protect the American people from terrorist attacks. This amendment would have done so by providing $8 billion in additional funds for homeland security. These funds would have come from restoring cuts to vital first responder programs in the Departments of Homeland Security and Justice. It also would have provided an additional $1.2 billion for first responders, $1.7 billion for the Coast Guard and port security, $150 million for chemical security, $1 billion for rail and transit security, $456 million for FEMA, $1 billion for health preparedness programs, and $752 million for aviation security.

At the time of this vote I was meeting with a group of Montana's high school students from Project Close-Up. This program introduces young people to Washington, DC and to the U.S. Government. I believe it is very important to give these students the unique opportunity to meet with their State's Senators in person—it is a tradition I have maintained for years. It is unfortunate that this vote to support homeland security occurred at the same time as the visit. For this reason, I must make it clear that I firmly believe in properly funding homeland security. I was one of the first Senators to visit New Orleans and the gulf coast after Hurricane Katrina and I recognize that FEMA needs more funding to improve their mission and ability to properly respond to disasters.

Most importantly, our first responders in Montana are the backbone of emergency services in our State. We are a rural State, and our police and fire departments and hospitals call upon them to react across many miles to keep Montana's citizens safe. I have always voted in favor of these efforts in the past and I pledge to do so in the future.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, Senator CONRAD and I are fortunate to have an outstanding staff serving the members of the Senate Budget Committee. These professionals work long hours and take great pride in the work of the committee and the institution of the U.S. Senate.

I would like to take just a few minutes today to single out two of these talented individuals who work on the majority side or Republican committee staff.

David Fisher serves as our health policy director on the committee. As Willie Sutton said, ''You rob banks because that's where the money is,'' and with respect to the Federal budget, the money is in health care. Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security are three programs that David handles for our team, and these three programs are on a glidepath to consume over 20 percent of this Nation's gross domestic product in about 30 years. If we do not find a way to control the growth of spending for these programs, there simply will not be resources available for all other priorities, from national defense to homeland security to science and research.

David came over to the Budget Committee from the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee in 2005. David holds a master's in public policy degree from Georgetown University. He has held a number of key positions in both the Senate and the House of Representatives having served as both a chief of staff and legislative director.

David is one of those rare individuals who can drill into specific programmatic detail and simultaneously understand the broader policy and political context in which programs operate. He is a perfectionist. David has a complete top-to-bottom understanding of medical and health care programs and has staffed me with distinction with such issues as bioterrorism, medical liability reform, and FDA drug approval. Most recently, he has been working tirelessly on Avian flu preparedness.

David Fisher has earned a reputation around town, here in Congress, and down at the White House as an expert on health issues. Few people who have worked with David have not been impressed with intellect and dedication. I am proud to have him on my team.

For many people, the budget resolution is just a compilation of accounts and dollar levels. But the budget is much more. The budget is a framework, a blueprint for the Federal Government and fiscal policy. Maybe good public policy states that policy drives budgets, but it is no secret that in Washington budgets often drive policy. The budget and our resolution have a real impact on the financial markets and economy.

When I took over the committee, a number of people advised me to make sure that we employed a talented economist. We are fortunate in Dan Brandt to have just that.

Dan Brandt serves as our Committee chief economist, and he also serves as analyst for a number of budget functions, such as what we call function 370 or commerce and housing credit. Dan is our expert who keeps on top of what the economy is doing, what is happening at the Federal Reserve, at the Securities and Exchange Commission, at the stock exchanges, and international finance. Dan is our ''go to guy'' for understanding the latest GDP and employment statistics, inflation, and other economic data. He is our expert on tax policy and works closely with the Finance Committee in ensuring that we are advocating progrowth tax policies. He works closely with the Banking Committee on a number of issues affecting financial institutions and the lending industry.

Dan's academic background is in business administration and economics at the Johns Hopkins University, the American University, and the Frei Universitat in Berlin, Germany. Prior to joining the committee, Dan worked in the House of Representatives, at Solomon Smith Barney, and at the International Trade Administration in the U.S. Department of Commerce. During 2004, Dan Brandt worked on President George W. Bush's reelection campaign where he handled tax and economic issues.

Dan is a workhorse for the committee. Few people could serve as a guide through the intricacies of economic forecasts and the budget rules—Dan can do both. The technical accuracy and effectiveness of his work products is a matter of personal pride. I have learned that he is a professional staff member in every sense of the word. I will conclude by just saying that Dan Brandt is a real credit to the Senate, and we are fortunate to have him here on our Budget Committee and as part of my team.

Mr. President, we are now able to go to final passage. Before we go to final passage, I wish to begin by thanking Senator CONRAD and his extraordinary staff.

AMENDMENT NO. 3081 WITHDRAWN

Before I do that, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the pending amendment No. 3081 at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, we are now able to go to final passage. Before we go to final passage, I wish to begin by thanking Senator CONRAD and his extraordinary staff, led by Mary Naylor. They have been incredibly cooperative. They are always extraordinarily professional. There is no question but we would not have been able to complete this—in what may not seem timely to most folks because we have been here all day but is—quite honestly we could have been here into tomorrow or Saturday without the extraordinary cooperation of the Senator from North Dakota and his team. I thank him for his professionalism and their team.

I also thank my Committee on the Budget staff. They have worked tirelessly and continuously on this budget for the last 6 weeks. They literally have gotten very little sleep, especially, of course, Scott Gudes, my budget leader, and Denzel McGuire, his top assistant. They did a great job of organizing, especially today, the amendments.

Jeff Turcotte, Dave Myers, and Sam Donoghue of our communications team, who has tried to compete with the chart machine on the other side of the aisle, they have come close. They have done a great job. Jim Hearn and Cheri Reidy, David Pappone and Gail Millar, are the specialists who make this place work. The cornerstone of the great team, John Mashburn, and Vas Chrisopoulos, my AA who keeps everything humming along and does an incredible job on my personal staff, and I thank the leadership staff. There are an awful lot of good people working for the leadership around here. They should be acknowledged for their tremendous work.

Let me thank the clerks and all the Senate staff. They have worked all day with virtually no break, along with the Reporters of Debates. I thank everyone for an extraordinary amount of commitment to making this place work correctly.

This budget is now on the verge of being passed. It is the first step in the process. As I have said before, it is the responsibility of governance to pass a budget. That is our responsibility as Senators. This is a responsible budget. It is not everything I wanted, obviously, but it is a step in the right direction. It is a step on the road, and it is a positive step on the road.

Rather than prolong the discussion, because we have had a lot of discussion on it, I will now yield the floor to the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, first, I want to indicate that we may have one matter to conclude before we end.

AMENDMENT NO. 3023, AS MODIFIED

Mr. President, I send to the desk amendment No. 3023, as modified, and ask unanimous consent that it be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3023), as modified, was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To strengthen homeland security by adding $10 million to National Defense for an interoperable and survivable mobile wireless communications network enabling clear, reliable communications among DoD and first responders for the military homeland defense command)

On page 9, line 20, increase the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 9, line 21, increase the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 27, line 23, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 27, line 24, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, we are prepared to go to final passage. We cannot do that without first thanking people. This has been a marathon, and people—many people—have worked around the clock to get us to this position.

Let me thank a colleague because we would not be finishing at 7:15 without the extraordinary work of Senator PATTY MURRAY.

Thank you, PATTY.

She convinced literally dozens of our colleagues to drop amendments tonight; otherwise, we would have been here until 2 o'clock in the morning. So special thanks to her.

And thanks to my staff director, Mary Naylor; and John Righter, my deputy staff director; Lisa Konwinski, my counsel; and, most of all, my chart master, Kobye Noel.

And thanks to the staff of Senator GREGG: Scott Gudes and Denzel McGuire, outstanding professionals.

Of course, my personal thanks to the chairman of the committee, who has been so decent to deal with, and so honorable to deal with.

On our side, Mr. Chairman, we thank you for your courtesies.

With that, let me conclude on the budget itself.

Mr. GREGG. No.

Mr. CONRAD. Oh, yes.

Borrow and spend—that is what this budget represents.

Mr. President and colleagues, as shown on this chart, this is what is going to happen to the debt under this budget. It is up, up, and away. A vote for this budget is a vote for more debt, higher interest rates, a weaker economy, the export of American jobs, the selling off of America, piece by piece.

Colleagues, we could do a whole lot better than this. I urge my colleagues to vote no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I have been asked to remind Senators that there will be two more votes, after the final vote on the budget, on judges.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on the adoption of the concurrent resolution.

The clerk will please call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 74 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Alexander	Domenici	McConnell
Allard	Enzi	Murkowski
Allen	Frist	Roberts
Bennett	Graham	Santorum
Bond	Grassley	Sessions
Brownback	Gregg	Shelby
Bunning	Hagel	Smith
Burns	Hatch	Snowe
Burr	Hutchison	Specter
Chambliss	Inhofe	Stevens
Coburn	Isakson	Sununu
Cochran	Kyl	Talent
Cornyn	Landrieu	Thomas
Craig	Lott	Thune
Crapo	Lugar	Vitter
DeMint	Martinez	Voinovich
Dole	McCain	Warner

NAYS—49

Akaka	Dorgan	Menendez
Baucus	Durbin	Mikulski
Bayh	Ensign	Murray
Biden	Feingold	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Feinstein	Nelson (NE)
Boxer	Harkin	Obama
Byrd	Inouye	Pryor
Cantwell	Jeffords	Reed
Carper	Johnson	Reid
Chafee	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Clinton	Kerry	Salazar
Coleman	Kohl	Sarbanes
Collins	Lautenberg	Schumer
Conrad	Leahy	Stabenow
Dayton	Levin	Wyden
DeWine	Lieberman	
Dodd	Lincoln	

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 83), as amended, was agreed to.

(The resolution will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I would be remiss if I did not make at least a short statement on the budget we just passed. I agree with those who believe that government is simply out of control. We just passed a budget that promises a budget deficit in the vicinity of $400 billion, a truly staggering amount of money. Our Federal Government is borrowing in excess of a billion dollars a day to fund the awesome amount of obligations that we have authorized. While I would have preferred

a vastly smaller budget today, I know it is simply not politically feasible to do so at this time. I pledge to work toward creating an environment where we can achieve responsible spending and fiscal sanity while meeting our obligations. The budget we have just passed does represent a step, albeit a small one, toward fiscal responsibility. Getting our entitlement spending under control, reining in earmarks and other wasteful discretionary spending, and maintaining the conditions necessary for strong, stable economic growth are all necessary to achieve a balanced budget, and it will take the concerted efforts of each and every one of us to achieve this in the future.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, today, the Senate allowed its budget process to be hijacked by those seeking to move a policy issue that has been rightly rejected so many times. I opposed the manipulation of process in the Budget Committee and I opposed final passage this evening. Using the reconciliation process to advance a single controversial policy—a policy that should be considered through the appropriate legislative channels—is shameless.

We debated drilling in the Arctic last spring. We debated it again last fall, and at that time, a number of House Republicans shot the idea down. Then, in December, we wasted more time on the issue. This year, nine members of the Budget Committee reached out ahead of time to Chairman GREGG and Ranking Member CONRAD asking that the budget process not be used to revisit drilling in the Arctic Refuge, and yet, it was. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, March 6, 2006.

Hon. JUDD GREGG,
Chairman, Budget Committee,
Washington, DC.
Hon. KENT CONRAD,
Ranking Member, Budget Committee
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GREGG AND RANKING MEMBER CONRAD: As members of the Budget Committee, we write to express our opposition to the inclusion of any language or mechanism in the fiscal year 2007 budget resolution that assumes revenues from drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge or allows for the insertion of any provision that opens the Coastal Plain of the Refuge to oil and gas drilling and exploration. We also strongly oppose the inclusion of any Arctic Refuge reconciliation instructions for the Energy Committee in the budget resolution.

It is irresponsible to base the country's budget on highly speculative and dubious projections of lease revenues for the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. The reality is that leasing portions of the Arctic Refuge would likely not bring in the assumed levels of revenue to the federal treasury, and yet, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) assumes $6 billion in revenue from leasing of the Arctic Refuge, and the President's fiscal year 2007 budget proposal presupposes $7 billion in revenue from a 2008 Refuge lease sale. Previous drilling proposals called for leasing between 400,000 and 600,000 acres of the Arctic Refuge. The Administration proposal would therefore require that industry bid at least $11,667 per leased acre. The facts of oil and gas leasing on Alaska's North Slope and elsewhere in the country show that such a proposal is far out of touch with reality:

Since 1991, 38 leases on the North Slope and in near-shore waters have brought in an average of only $64.38 per leased acre. The Administration's projection is 181 times this historic average.

Last year, the oil industry bid $161.55 per acre for areas offshore of the Arctic Refuge—an amount that is nearly an order of magnitude lower than the Administration's projections.

The CBO acknowledged in December 2005 that higher oil prices do not necessarily result in higher lease bids when it wrote that other factors, such as operating and capital costs and the attractiveness of competing projects elsewhere, influence bid amounts.

The North Slope leasing history demonstrates CBO's point. In the last five years, when North Slope crude averaged $33.60 a barrel, the average price per acre was $48.15. In the five years prior to that, when North Slope crude averaged $19.60, the average price per acre was $93.58. Additionally, preliminary analysis of two lease sales held on March 1, 2006 reveals an average per acre price of less than $40 on a day when North Slope crude was selling for $59.11.

This kind of budget charade will simply not help reduce our huge and growing federal deficit.

As we all know, the President acknowledged our addiction to oil during his State of the Union address. As with any addiction, recognition of the problem is the first step toward change. Thus, now more than ever, instead of looking to drill to the past in areas such as the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, we should truly dedicate ourselves to a cleaner energy future. The American people expect Congress and the Administration to stop wasting their time on dead-end drilling schemes and to instead chart an energy vision reflective of the 21st century.

Again, we encourage you to reject any requests that are intended to misuse the budget process to open the Refuge to oil and gas drilling and exploration and we thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Russ Feingold, Patty Murray, Tim Johnson, Bill Nelson, Robert Menendez, Paul S. Sarbanes, Ron Wyden, Robert C. Byrd, Debbie Stabenow.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I oppose drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, but if we are going to debate this policy, we should do so openly—not through a backdoor budget maneuver. My colleagues who want to open the Arctic Refuge to drilling should go through the regular legislative process that the rest of us use to advance policy initiatives. After all, what message do you send when you manipulate a process simply because the normal procedure does not give you the outcome you want? That is not a message this body should endorse.

Proponents will say that using the budget process is the only way they can get an up-or-down vote. My response is simple. I know how hard it is to be very close to having the votes to pass legislation, but not quite being there. Senator MCCAIN and I worked very hard on our campaign finance reform legislation to get the votes needed to move forward—it took years—but we stuck with it until we could get the legislation passed. We fought hard but we fought fair. We did not—and we would not have—tried to advance our legislation by manipulating the budget process. This single reconciliation instruction opening up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is simply out of bounds.

My concerns, however, go beyond the obvious abuse of process. The bottom line is that the revenue assumptions are highly speculative and in no way reflect reality. For a second, let's ignore the fact that last year a Bush adviser was quoted as saying that ''even if you gave the oil companies the refuge for free, they wouldn't want to drill there'' and let's look at the numbers.

The Congressional Budget Office assumes $6 billion in revenues while the President's budget puts the number at $7 billion. Based on past proposals, 400,000 to 600,000 acres in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge would be on the leasing block. Therefore, to achieve the administration's estimate, companies would have to pay between $17,500 and $11,667 per acre to make it to the $7 billion level. To get to CBO's estimate, they would have to pay between $15,000 and $10,000 per acre to get to a total of $6 billion. Now let's consider these numbers a bit more closely to see how they line up with reality:

Since 1991, 40 lease sales on the North Slope and in near-shore waters have brought in an average of only $60.47 per leased acre in real 2006 dollars. CBO's projections are 165 times greater than the inflation-adjusted average during the last 16 years.

Think that higher gas prices will mean higher lease bids? Think again. In December of 2005, CBO said that higher gas prices at the pump don't directly translate into higher lease bids by oil companies, and cited other factors—such as operating and capital costs and the attractiveness of competing projects elsewhere—that influence bid amounts.

Additionally, the reconciliation instruction assumes $3 billion in Federal revenues, based on a 50/50 split between the State of Alaska and the U.S. Treasury. Given public statements by members of the Alaska delegation, as recently as last December, this 50/50 split is, at best, speculative.

Some may argue that oil company activities in the Arctic Refuge could be done in an environmentally safe manner. I would point out to them that earlier this month the largest crude oil spill in the history of oil and gas operations was discovered on Alaska's North Slope. To quote an employee of the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation, ''Hopefully, the tundra will recover. It's never going to be perfect.'' I don't think anyone wants to contemplate the possibility of such an accident occurring within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

During his State of the Union Address, the President acknowledged our

addiction to oil. I hoped that this would mean we could move forward to discuss real energy solutions, solutions that protect our national security, our citizens, and our environment, as I continue to believe that we can do all three. In fact, there are bipartisan bills out there to move our transportation sector to renewable sources of energy and sadly we spend our time talking about this issue, an issue that divides us. When are we going to move past this divisive debate to discuss real energy solutions for the 21st century?

If we do not stand against misuse of the legislative process, then every member of this esteemed body is at risk. Today, I cast a vote against abuse and in favor of the integrity of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JACK ZOUHARY TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will go into executive session and proceed to consider the nomination of Jack Zouhary to be U.S. District Judge for the Northern District of Ohio, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jack Zouhary, of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Vermont.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today the Senate considers two more lifetime appointments to U.S. courts. These confirmations will bring the total number of judicial appointments since January 2001 to 234, including the confirmations of two Supreme Court Justices and 43 circuit court judges. Of course, 100 judges were confirmed during the 17 months when there was a Democratic majority in the Senate. In the other 45 months, 134 judges have been confirmed. Ironically, under Democratic leadership, the Senate was almost twice as productive as under Republican leadership.

It is most regrettable that this President has not fulfilled his promise to the American people to be a uniter. Nor has he fulfilled his pledge to complete his work in advance of vacancies and to make nominations promptly. Judicial vacancies have grown to more than 50 and the White House has failed to send nominees for more than half of those. Some of those vacancies have been sitting empty for more than a year. Over and over the White House has missed the deadline the President established for himself, and today, more than half of the judicial vacancies, 27, are without nominations. One-third of those vacancies are already more than 180 days old, and one-third of the judicial emergency vacancies are without nominees.

If the White House would eliminate its partisan, political, and ideological litmus tests from the judicial nominations process and its emphasis on rewarding cronies and focus only on qualifications and consensus, the job of selecting nominees and our job of considering them for confirmation would be much easier.

Jack Zouhary, the nominee from Ohio, has the support of his Republican home State Senators, and Stephen G. Larson, the nominee from California, has the support of his Democratic home State Senators. They are the kind of qualified consensus nominees who are confirmed relatively easily.

Recently we have seen the President withdraw a circuit nomination after information became public about that nominee's rulings in a number of cases in which he appears to have had a conflict of interest. Those conflicts were pointed out not by the administration's screening process or by the ABA but by online journalists.

At a minimum that case and other recent revelations reinforce a point about this White House's poor vetting process for important nominations. A number of nominations by this President have had to be withdrawn. Among the more well known are Bernard Kerik to head Homeland Security, Harriet Miers to the Supreme Court, and Claude Allen to be a Fourth Circuit judge. It was, as I recall, reporting in a national magazine that doomed the Kerik nomination. It was opposition within the President's own party that doomed the Miers nomination. Democratic Senators resisted the nomination of Allen, a Virginian, because the President was seeking to appoint someone from another State to a Maryland seat on the Fourth Circuit. When we are considering lifetime appointments of judicial officers who are entrusted with protecting the rights of Americans, it is important to be thorough. Unfortunately, all too often this White House seems more interested in rewarding cronies.

The Senate now considers two more lifetime appointments to U.S. courts. These confirmations will bring the total number of judicial appointments, since January 2001, to 234, including the confirmations of two Supreme Court Justices and 43 circuit court judges. Of course, 100 judges were confirmed during the 17 months when there was a Democratic majority in the Senate. In the other 45 months, 134 judges have been confirmed. Ironically, under Democratic leadership, the Senate was almost twice as productive as under Republican leadership.

It is most regrettable that this President has not fulfilled his promise to the American people to be a uniter. Nor has he fulfilled his pledge to complete his work in advance of vacancies and to make nominations promptly. Judicial vacancies have grown to more than 50 and the White House has failed to send nominees for more than half of those. Some of those vacancies have been sitting empty for more than a year. Over and over the White House has missed the deadline the President established for himself, and today, more than half of the judicial vacancies, 27, are without nominations. One-third of those vacancies are already more than 180 days old and one-third of the judicial emergency vacancies are without nominees.

If the White House would eliminate its partisan political and ideological litmus tests from the judicial nominations process and its emphasis on rewarding cronies and focus only on qualifications and consensus, the job of selecting nominees and our job of considering them for confirmation would be much easier.

Jack Zouhary, the nominee from Ohio, has the support of his Republican home-State Senators and Stephen G. Larson, the nominee from California, has the support of his Democratic home-State Senators. They are the kind of qualified consensus nominees who are confirmed relatively easily.

Recently we have seen the President withdraw a circuit nomination after information became public about that nominee's rulings in a number of cases in which he appears to have had a conflict of interest. Those conflicts were pointed out not by the administration's screening process or by the ABA, but by online journalists.

At a minimum that case and other recent revelations reinforce a point about this White House's poor vetting process for important nominations. A number of nominations by this President have had to be withdrawn. Among the more well known are Bernard Kerik to head Homeland Security, Harriet Miers to the Supreme Court, and Claude Allen to be a Fourth Circuit judge. It was, as I recall, reporting in a national magazine that doomed the Kerik nomination. It was opposition within the President's own party that doomed the Miers nomination. Democratic Senators resisted the nomination of Allen, a Virginian, because the President was seeking to appoint someone from another State to a Maryland seat on the Fourth Circuit. When we are considering lifetime appointments of judicial officers who are entrusted with protecting the rights of Americans, it is important to be thorough. Unfortunately, all too often this White House seems more interested in rewarding cronies.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in strong support of the nomination of Judge Jack Zouhary, whom the President has nominated to be United States District Court Judge for the Northern District of Ohio. Judge Zouhary currently is serving on the Lucas County Common Pleas Court. His service there has been outstanding and is an excellent indication of the type of judge he will be on the Federal bench.

I'd like to share with my Senate colleagues just a few of the numerous admirable qualities that make Judge Zouhary such an outstanding nominee. Both as a professional and as a person, he is exactly the sort of individual we want to be serving on the Federal bench.

Judge Zouhary grew up in Toledo. He is a first-generation American, whose parents immigrated from Lebanon to the United States and instilled in their son a respect for the values of education, religion, and community service. After graduating as the valedictorian of his high school, he attended Dartmouth College, where he received his undergraduate degree before returning to his hometown to earn his law degree from the University of Toledo College of Law. Judge Zouhary then embarked on what would become a long and accomplished legal career—a career with 30 years of legal experience that has given him the background and understanding of our legal system to successfully take on the role of a Federal judge.

He began his legal career with the law firm of Robison, Curphey & O'Connell, where he worked as an associate and then as a partner. During his 23 years there, he had a varied practice, representing individuals and businesses on a range of legal issues, with an emphasis on civil trial practice and corporate matters. In 2000, Judge Zouhary became the Senior Vice President and General Counsel for S.E. Johnson Companies, Inc., a large highway contractor and asphalt producer.

In 2004, Judge Zouhary accepted a position as ''Of Counsel'' with the law firm of Fuller & Henry. He remained with Fuller & Henry until 2005, when Ohio Governor Bob Taft appointed him to the Lucas County Common Pleas Court. In Ohio, the Common Pleas Court is the highest state trial bench and hears all major civil and criminal cases.

During his time as an attorney in private practice, Judge Zouhary distinguished himself as an excellent litigator and was honored by being selected as a member of the prestigious American College of Trial Lawyers. Membership in the American College of Trial Lawyers is by invitation only and is limited to the best of the trial bar.

Judge Zouhary has long been committed to the ideals of civility and professionalism in the legal field. Friends and colleagues often describe him as ''a gentleman.'' I agree with that assessment. He is well regarded for his honesty, his integrity, and his intelligence, and those who have known and worked with him through the years speak warmly of his even-temper and cordial demeanor.

Not surprisingly, given his interest in preserving a less combative approach to the law, Judge Zouhary frequently has presented lectures focusing on legal ethics and civility in the practice of law for Continuing Legal Education Seminars. His commitment to serving the community as a professional also is exemplified by his membership in the Toledo Rotary Club, as well as his participation in a broad array of other charitable activities, ranging from pro bono work for a local church to service at a community soup kitchen.

Although he has been a Common Pleas judge for only a relatively short time, Judge Zouhary already has distinguished himself on the bench. He has worked diligently to clear a very large backlog of cases from his crowded docket and has made a good deal of headway in that effort. Most important, attorneys who have appeared before him—criminal and civil, prosecution and defense—speak in glowing terms of his talent, fairness, and excellent judicial temperament.

With Judge Zouhary's impressive record as a legal professional and community leader, it should come as no surprise that the American Bar Association was unanimous in giving him its highest rating of ''well-qualified.'' Judge Zouhary is in every way an outstanding nominee, who will serve the people of Ohio and of this country well.

I strongly support the nomination of Judge Jack Zouhary as a Federal District Court Judge for the Northern District of Ohio.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be vitiated on the nomination of Judge Stephen Larson so that it can be done by voice vote. I see the distinguished leaders on the Senate floor. I don't think there is any objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. That is my St. Patrick's Day gift to the body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Jack Zouhary, of Ohio, to be U.S. District Judge for the Northern District of Ohio? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senators were necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma, (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Mississippi, (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Nevada, (Mr. ENSIGN), and the Senator from Oklahoma, (Mr. INHOFE).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THUNE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 75 Ex.]

YEAS—96

Akaka	Domenici	McConnell
Alexander	Dorgan	Menendez
Allard	Durbin	Mikulski
Allen	Enzi	Murkowski
Baucus	Feingold	Murray
Bayh	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Bennett	Frist	Nelson (NE)
Biden	Graham	Obama
Bingaman	Grassley	Pryor
Bond	Gregg	Reed
Boxer	Hagel	Reid
Brownback	Harkin	Roberts
Bunning	Hatch	Rockefeller
Burns	Hutchison	Salazar
Burr	Inouye	Santorum
Byrd	Isakson	Sarbanes
Cantwell	Jeffords	Schumer
Carper	Johnson	Sessions
Chafee	Kennedy	Shelby
Chambliss	Kerry	Smith
Clinton	Kohl	Snowe
Coleman	Kyl	Specter
Collins	Landrieu	Stabenow
Conrad	Lautenberg	Stevens
Cornyn	Leahy	Sununu
Craig	Levin	Talent
Crapo	Lieberman	Thomas
Dayton	Lincoln	Thune
DeMint	Lott	Vitter
DeWine	Lugar	Voinovich
Dodd	Martinez	Warner
Dole	McCain	Wyden

NOT VOTING—4

Coburn	Ensign
Cochran	Inhofe

The nomination was confirmed.

NOTICE

Incomplete record of Senate proceedings.

Today's Senate proceedings will be continued in Book II.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS:

Senate passed H.J. Res. 47, Debt-Limit Extension.

Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 83, Congressional Budget Resolution.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2255–S2294

Measures Introduced: Thirty bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2426–2455, and S. Res. 403–404. **(See next issue.)**

Measures Reported:

S. 598, to reauthorize provisions in the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 relating to Native Hawaiian low-income housing and Federal loan guarantees for Native Hawaiian housing. (S. Rept. No. 109–221).

S. 1057, to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to revise and extend that Act, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 109–222). **(See next issue.)**

Measures Passed:

Debt-Limit Extension: By 52 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. 54), Senate passed H.J. Res. 47, increasing the statutory limit on the public debt, and the Senate then began consideration of the joint resolution, after taking action on the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S2236–41**

Rejected:

By 44 yeas to 55 nays (Vote No. 53), Baucus/Lincoln Amendment No. 3131, to require a study of debt held by foreigners. **Page S2236**

Subsequently, the measure was cleared for the President.

Congressional Budget Resolution: By 51 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 74), Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 83, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2007 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2006 and 2008 through 2011, after taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S2225–36, S2241–93**

Adopted:

By 99 yeas to 1 nay (Vote No. 56), Burr Amendment No. 3114, to provide for the establishment of a reserve fund concerning pandemic influenza preparedness planning. **Pages S2231–32, S2241**

Vitter Amendment No. 3078, to establish a reserve fund to prevent catastrophic loss. **Pages S2243, S2250**

Gregg (for Baucus) Amendment No. 3041, to provide funding for an Internet Crimes Against Children task force in Montana. **Page S2250**

Gregg (for Snowe) Amendment No. 3134, to prevent an increase in interest rates paid by disaster victims, and to increase funding for the SBA's Microloans, Small Business Development Centers, HUBZones, and other small business development programs, and to offset the cost through a reduction in funds under Function 920. **Page S2250**

Gregg (for Lautenberg) Amendment No. 3045, to add $8 million to Function 300 (Environment and Natural Resources) for Highlands Land Acquisition. Fully offset with Function 920. **Page S2250**

Gregg (for Coleman) Amendment No. 3123, to increase funding to fully fund the Clean Coal Power Initiative. **Page S2250**

Conrad Modified Amendment No. 3136, to provide a reserve fund for bold energy legislation that is deficit-neutral. **Pages S2230–31, S2249, S2250**

By 51 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 57), Reed Amendment No. 3074, to increase funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program by $3,318,000,000 for fiscal year 2007, increasing the funds available to carry out that program to the fully authorized level of $5,100,000,000, to be paid for by closing corporate tax loopholes. **Pages S2229–30, S2254**

By 73 yeas to 27 nays (Vote No. 58), Specter Amendment No. 3048, to increase the advance appropriations allowance in order to fund health, education and training, and low-income programs.

Pages S2225, S2254–55

Lautenberg Amendment No. 3137, to eliminate the President's proposed tax increase on American airline passengers in fiscal year 2007 and to provide adequate funding for commercial aviation security and to offset these costs by closing corporate tax loopholes. **Pages S2231, S2256**

Collins Amendment No. 3066, to ensure that first responder and state and local government grant programs key to our Nation's homeland security are funded at no less than fiscal year 2006 levels and to provide increases for port security, first responder programs, rail/transit security, and National Response Plan Training, offset by discretionary spending reductions. **Pages S2246–48**

Gregg (for Obama) Amendment No. 3144, to provide a $40 million increase in fiscal year 2007 for the Homeless Veterans Reintegration Program and to improve job services for hard-to-place veterans.

Pages S2261–63

Gregg (for Ensign) Amendment No. 3085, to provide funding to hire an additional 500 Border Patrol Agents; fully funding the promise Congress made to the American people to hire 2,000 new agents in fiscal year 2007 as authorized by the National Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 and as recommended by the 9/11 Commission. **Pages S2261–63**

Gregg (for Levin) Amendment No. 3140, to provide funds to establish additional Northern Border Air Wings, offset through reductions in Function 920. **Pages S2261–63**

Gregg (for Landrieu) Amendment No. 3139, to provide funding for maintaining a robust long range bomber force including 94 B–52 aircraft.

Pages S2261–63

Gregg (for Lincoln) Amendment No. 3053, to provide for restoring funding for the portion of the COPS program devoted to countering methamphetamine, offset by a reduction to Function 920 (Allowances). **Pages S2261–63**

Gregg (for DeWine/Leahy) Amendment No. 3079, to increase funding for Child Survival and Maternal Health Programs. **Pages S2261–63**

Gregg (for DeWine) Amendment No. 3083, to increase funding for the Children's Hospitals Graduate Medical Education Program under the Public Health Service Act for fiscal year 2007.

Pages S2261–63

Gregg (for DeWine) Amendment No. 3033, to increase funding for NASA aeronautics programs by $179,000,000 in fiscal year 2007, with an offset.

Pages S2261–63

Gregg (for Leahy) Amendment No. 3154, to fund grants for bulletproof vests for law enforcement agencies at the full authorized level. **Pages S2261–63**

Gregg (for Baucus) Amendment No. 3059, to improve America's economic competitiveness.

Pages S2261–63

Gregg (for Salazar) Amendment No. 3155, to fully fund the Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) program. Adds $152 million to Function 800 (General Government) for PILT. **Page S2262**

Gregg (for Stabenow/Levin) Amendment No. 3156, to protect the American people from terrorist attacks and threats to public health by collecting a fee for inspection exclusively of international trash shipments at the U.S. border generating $45 million in receipts. The fee will help defray the cost of increasing the number and quality of inspections of these potentially dangerous shipments at the border. The fee for inspection service will be implemented to be fully compliant with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and other applicable trade agreements. **Pages S2262–63**

Nelson Amendment No. 3001, to provide funds ensuring Survivor Benefit Plan annuities are not reduced by the amount of dependency and indemnity compensation that military families receive, and to provide funds for ''paid-up'' SBP, offset by closing abusive corporate tax loopholes. **Pages S2265–66**

Santorum Amendment No. 3052, to continue providing 33 percent of the Global Fund's revenue and to contribute an additional $566,000,000 to the Global Fund for fiscal year 2007 to support grant renewals and new proposals to support international HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria programs.

Gregg (for Dodd/DeWine) Amendment No. 3111, to establish a reserve fund for the FIRE and SAFER programs. **Pages S2267–69**

Gregg (for Hutchison) Amendment No. 3110, to provide a reserve fund to ensure that physicians will receive an appropriate reimbursement rate under Medicare instead of a scheduled cut which would threaten the adequate provision of care for seniors and disabled citizens. **Pages S2269–71**

Gregg (for Kohl/Biden) Amendment No. 3057, to restore $380 million to juvenile justice programs funded by the Department of Justice, offset by a reduction to Function 920 (Allowances).

Pages S2269–71

Gregg (for Feinstein/Mikulski) Amendment No. 3067, to provide $390,000,000 in fiscal year 2007 for cancer funding in the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Health Resources and Services Administration paid for by closing corporate tax loopholes.

Pages S2269–71

Gregg (for Clinton/Mikulski) Amendment No. 3147, to restore funding for the Alzheimer's Association 24/7 Contact Center (under Training, Research and Discretionary Programs), Alzheimer's Disease Demonstration Grants, Preventive Health Services, Home-Delivered Nutrition Services, Congregate Nutrition Services, the Nutrition Services Incentive Program, the National Family Caregiver Support Program, and the Long-Term Care Ombudsmen Program in the Administration on Aging, fully offset through closing corporate tax loopholes.

Pages S2269–71

Gregg (for Salazar) Amendment No. 3089, to restore $100 million to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Stateside Grant Program by closing corporate tax loopholes. **Pages S2269–71, S2273–74**

Gregg (for Brownback) Amendment No. 3167, to establish a reserve fund for a Commission for Accountability and Review of Federal Agencies.

Page S2271

Gregg (for Baucus) Amendment No. 3168, to expand funding for the High-Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA) Program, offset through reductions in Function 920; and to ensure that HIDTA funding remains in ONDCP. **Page S2271**

Gregg (for Graham) Amendment No. 3169, to restore funding for a pilot project in the Port of Charleston that coordinates over 50 State and local law enforcement agencies to prevent and detect acts of terrorism and criminal activity. **Page S2271**

By 51 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 72), Domenici Amendment No. 3128, to provide funding for implementing the Energy Policy Act of 2005 from ANWR. **Page S2272**

Vitter/Landrieu Amendment No. 3165, to create a Gulf Coast Protection, Reconstruction and Recovery Fund to provide assistance to coastal states for coastal conservation, mitigation, and resource protection activities. **Pages S2272–73**

Gregg (for Levin) Amendment No. 3031, to provide funding for the Advanced Technology Program to help ensure America's competitive advantage and fully offset with reductions in function 920.

Pages S2273–74

Conrad/Gregg Amendment No. 3170, to provide an additional $500 million to enhance the ability of the Internal Revenue Service to collect taxes owed but not paid voluntarily. **Pages S2273–74**

Gregg (for Byrd) Amendment No. 3171, to provide $184 million over five years for the Mine Safety and Health Administration to hire additional mine safety inspectors. **Pages S2273–74**

Gregg (for Lott) Amendment No. 3152, to provide additional new budget authority and outlay authority for fiscal year 2007 for National Defense (050) in the amount of $3,700,000,000, the amount requested for defense for fiscal year 2007 in the budget of the President for fiscal year 2006, in order to fund principal unfunded priorities of the military departments and fund an authorized end strength of active duty members of the Army of 512,400, and an authorized end strength of active duty members of the Marine Corps of 179,000, for fiscal year 2007.

Page S2275

Gregg (for Schumer) Amendment No. 3172, to add $308 million to Function 800 for GSA. Fully offset by Function 920. **Page S2275**

Gregg (for Salazar) Modified Amendment No. 3023, to strengthen homeland security by adding $10 million to National Defense for an interoperable and survivable mobile wireless communications network enabling clear, reliable communications among Department of Defense and first responders for the military homeland defense command. **Page S2291**

Rejected:

By 44 yeas to 55 nays (Vote No. 55), Conrad Amendment No. 3133, to increase funding to combat avian flu, increase local preparedness, and create a Manhattan Project-like effort to develop a vaccine to inoculate the U.S. population against a pandemic by $5 billion in FY 2007 paid for by requiring tax withholding on government payments to contractors like Halliburton. **Pages S2226–27, S2241**

By 43 yeas to 53 nays (Vote No. 59), Lieberman/Mikulski Amendment No. 3034, to protect the American people from terrorist attacks by providing $8 billion in additional funds for homeland security government-wide, by restoring cuts to vital first responder programs in the Departments of Homeland Security and Justice, by providing an additional $1.2 billion for first responders, $1.7 billion for the Coast Guard and port security, $150 million for chemical security, $1 billion for rail and transit security, $456 million for FEMA, $1 billion for health preparedness programs, and $752 million for aviation security.

Pages S2227–29, S2255–56

By 48 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 60), Sarbanes Amendment No. 3103, to restore funding for the civil works programs of the Corps of Engineers, the Federal Water Pollution Control State Revolving Fund, the National Park Service, the Forest Service, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Federal conservation programs, and other natural resource needs, through an offset achieved by closing corporate tax loopholes.

Pages S2233–34, S2256–57

By 42 yeas to 56 nays (Vote No. 61), Dorgan Amendment No. 3102, to increase funding by $1 billion for various tribal programs and provide necessary additional funding based on recommendations from Indian country, by closing corporate tax loopholes. **Pages S2235–36, S2257**

By 43 yeas to 57 nays (Vote No. 62), Cornyn/Graham Amendment No. 3100, to provide for reconciliation instructions to the Committee on Finance to reduce mandatory spending.

Pages S2241–42, S2257–58

By 46 yeas to 54 nays (Vote No. 63), Stabenow Amendment No. 3141, to provide an assured stream of funding for veteran's health care that will take into account the annual changes in the veterans' population and inflation to be paid for by restoring the pre-2001 top rate for income over $1 million, closing corporate tax loopholes and delaying tax cuts for the wealthy. **Pages S2241–42, S2258–59**

By 49 yeas to 51 nays (Vote No. 64), Akaka Amendment No. 3071, to increase funding for Title I grants and reduce debt by closing corporate tax loopholes. **Pages S2244–46, S2259**

By 35 yeas to 62 nays (Vote No. 65), Inhofe Amendment No. 3093, to provide for discretionary spending control. **Pages S2259–60**

By 48 yeas to 52 nays (Vote No. 66), Lincoln Amendment No. 3106, to restore the discretionary budget for the Department of Agriculture with an offset achieved by closing corporate tax loopholes.

Pages S2249, S2249–50, S2260

By 46 yeas to 53 nays (Vote No. 67), Kerry Modified Amendment No. 3143, to prevent the imposition of excessive TRICARE fees and co-pays on military retirees. **Pages S2251–52, S2260–61**

By 46 yeas to 53 nays (Vote No. 68), DeMint Modified Amendment No. 3087, to establish a reserve fund for Social Security reform. **Page S2263**

Dayton Amendment No. 3097, to provide mandatory funding to fully fund the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B grants to states; paid for by closing corporate tax loopholes.

Page S2264

By 43 yeas to 57 nays (Vote No. 69), Boxer Amendment No. 3105, to increase funding for the 21st Century Community Learning Center program; paid for by rolling back tax cuts for those with incomes over $1 million. **Pages S2264–65**

By 50 yeas to 50 nays (Vote No. 70), Bingaman/Smith Amendment No. 3121, to strike the direct spending limitation. **Page S2265**

By 39 yeas to 60 nays (Vote No. 71), Stabenow Amendment No. 3164, to establish a reserve fund to allow for deficit-neutral legislation that would provide seniors with a prescription drug benefit option that is affordable, user-friendly, and administered directly by the Secretary of Health and Human Services. **Pages S2266–67**

Akaka Amendment No. 3044, to provide $310 million over five years in mandatory funding for non-service pensions for World War II Filipino veterans, paid for by closing corporate tax loopholes.

Page S2267

By 50 yeas to 50 nays (Vote No. 73), Ensign Amendment No. 3166, to deny funds in fiscal year 2007 for the United Nations Human Rights Council, which the United States just voted against because countries found complicit in sustained human rights abuses are eligible for council membership. Savings redirected to border security. **Pages S2274–75**

Withdrawn:

Reid (for Clinton/Reid) Amendment No. 3115, to increase funding in fiscal year 2007 by $347 million to restore funding or provide increased funding over fiscal year 2006 for programs and policies that support the delivery of contraceptive services and medically accurate information in order to reduce the number of unintended pregnancies, including Title X of the Public Health Service Act, and to restore funding or provide increased funding over fiscal year 2006 for programs that help women have healthy pregnancies and healthy children, including the Child Care Development Block Grant, Maternal and Child Health Block Grant, Healthy Start, and the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children paid for by closing corporate tax loopholes. **Pages S2225, S2254**

Conrad Amendment No. 3148, to create a deficit-neutral reserve fund for addressing the long-term fiscal challenges facing our nation, by creating a bipartisan commission or process to consider all parts of the budget, with everything on the table for discussion. **Pages S2253, S2260**

Hagel Amendment No. 3127, to establish a reserve fund for a Comprehensive Entitlement Reform Commission. **Pages S2252–53, S2260**

Lincoln Amendment No. 3047, to provide $7.8 billion over two years to fund refundable tax credits targeted to small businesses with up to 100 employees that they may help purchase group health insurance for their low-wage workers, paid for by closing corporate tax loopholes. **Pages S2248–49, S2260**

Salazar Amendment No. 3081, to fully fund the Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) program, by providing $152 million to Function 800 (General Government) for PILT, paid for by closing $152 million in corporate tax loopholes. **Pages S2232, S2291**

Honoring Members of the Armed Forces: Senate agreed to S. Res. 404, expressing the sense of the Senate that all people in the United States should participate in a moment of silence to reflect upon the service and sacrifice of members of the Armed Forces both at home and abroad. **(See next issue.)**

Robert T. Stafford White Rocks National Recreation Area: Senate passed S. 2447, to redesignate the

White Rocks National Recreation Area in the State of Vermont as the "Robert T. Stafford White Rocks National Recreation Area". **(See next issue.)**

Permitting Use of Capitol Rotunda: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 350, permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust. **(See next issue.)**

Permit Processing: Senate passed H.R. 4826, to extend through December 31, 2006, the authority of the Secretary of the Army to accept and expend funds contributed by non-Federal public entities to expedite the processing of permits, clearing the measure for the President. **(See next issue.)**

U.S. SAFE WEB Act: Senate passed S. 1608, to enhance Federal Trade Commission enforcement against illegal spam, spyware, and cross-border fraud and deception. **(See next issue.)**

Adjournment Resolution: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 361, providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate. **(See next issue.)**

Immigration Reform: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 2454, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform. **(See next issue.)**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 2454 and, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Tuesday, March 28, 2006. **(See next issue.)**

Legislative Transparency and Accountability Act Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Senate resume consideration of S. 2349, to provide greater transparency in the legislative process, at 1 p.m. on Monday, March 27, 2006. **(See next issue.)**

National Flood Insurance Program Enhanced Borrowing Authority Act—House Message: Senate concurred in the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill S. 2275, to temporarily increase the borrowing authority of the Federal Emergency Management Agency for carrying out the national flood insurance program, clearing the measure for the President. **(See next issue.)**

Signing Authority Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that during this adjournment of the Senate, the Majority Leader, and Senator DOMENICI, be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions. **(See next issue.)**

Authorizing Leadership To Make Appointments—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate, the President of the Senate, the President Pro Tempore, and the Majority and Minority Leaders be authorized to make appointments to commissions, committees, boards, conferences, or interparliamentary conferences authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate. **(See next issue.)**

Messages From the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the National Security Strategy of the United States of America; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. (PM–44) **(See next issue.)**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By unanimous vote of 96 yeas (Vote No. EX. 75), Jack Zouhary, of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Ohio.

Pages S2293–94

John F. Clark, of Virginia, to be Director of the United States Marshals Service.

Paul J. McNulty, of Virginia, to be Deputy Attorney General.

Robert C. Cresanti, of Texas, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Technology.

Stephen G. Larson, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

Alexander A. Karsner, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy).

Mark D. Wallace, of Florida, to be Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations for U.N. Management and Reform, with the rank of Ambassador.

Mark D. Wallace, of Florida, to be Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during his tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations for U.N. Management and Reform.

John A. Simon, of Maryland, to be Executive Vice President of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

Richard T. Miller, of Texas, to be Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

Richard T. Miller, of Texas, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United

Nations during his tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

David F. Kustoff, of Tennessee, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Tennessee for the term of four years.

2 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

2 Army nominations in the rank of general.

9 Coast Guard nominations in the rank of admiral.

12 Marine Corps nominations in the rank of general.

1 Navy nomination in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Coast Guard, Foreign Service, Marine Corps, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

(See next issue.)

Messages From the House: (See next issue.)

Measures Referred: (See next issue.)

Measures Placed on Calendar: (See next issue.)

Measures Read First Time: (See next issue.)

Enrolled Bills Presented: (See next issue.)

Petitions and Memorials: (See next issue.)

Executive Reports of Committees: (See next issue.)

Additional Cosponsors: (See next issue.)

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: (See next issue.)

Additional Statements: (See next issue.)

Amendments Submitted: (See next issue.)

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: (See next issue.)

Authorities for Committees to Meet: (See next issue.)

Privileges of the Floor: (See next issue.)

Record Votes: Twenty-three record votes were taken today. (Total—75)

Pages S2236, S2240–41, S2254–61, S2263, S2265, S2267, S2272, S2275, S2291

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9 a.m., and adjourned pursuant to the provisions of H. Con. Res. 361, at 10:04 p.m., until 1 p.m., on Monday, March 27, 2006. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in the next issue of the Record.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: FOREST SERVICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2007 for the Forest Service, after receiving testimony from Dale Bosworth, Chief, United States Forest Service, and Mark Rey, Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, both of the Department of Agriculture.

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, Treasury, the Judiciary, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2007 for the Department of Transportation and Amtrak, after receiving testimony from Norman Y. Mineta, Secretary, Joseph H. Boardman, Administrator, Federal Railroad Administration, and Mark Dayton, Senior Economist, Office of the Inspector General, all of the Department of Transportation; and David Hughes, President and Chief Executive Officer, and David M. Laney, Chairman of the Board, both of Amtrak.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the proposed defense authorization request for fiscal year 2007 and the future years defense program, focusing on military strategy and operational requirements, after receiving testimony from General John P. Abizaid, USA, Commander, United States Central Command; and General Bryan D. Brown, USA, Commander, United States Special Operations Command.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported 2,239 nominations in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

VOLCANIC HAZARDS IMPACTS ON AVIATION

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Disaster Prevention and Prediction concluded a hearing to examine the natural hazard threat that volcanoes pose to international aviation, after receiving testimony from James E. Quick, Program Coordinator, Volcano Hazards Program, U.S. Geological Survey, Department of the Interior; Terry McVenes, Air Line Pilots Association, International, Washington, D.C.; and John C. Eichelberger, University of Alaska, Fairbanks.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1215, to authorize the acquisition of interests in underdeveloped coastal areas in order to better ensure their protection from development, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nominations of Roger Shane Karr, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary, Tyler D. Duvall, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary, Nicole R. Nason, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, and Thomas J. Barrett, of Alaska, to be Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, all of the Department of Transportation, Robert C. Cresanti, of Texas, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Technology, Robert M. McDowell, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission, and sundry promotion lists in the Coast Guard and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

GREAT LAKES PROTECTION

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration's strategy to restore and protect the Great Lakes, after receiving testimony from Senators DeWine, Levin, and Stabenow; Stephen L. Johnson, Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency; Ohio Governor Bob Taft, Columbus, on behalf of the Council of Great Lakes Governors; Frank Ettawageshik, Little Traverse Bay Bands of Odawa Indians, Harbor Springs, Michigan; David Ullrich, Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Cities Initiative, Chicago, Illinois; George Kuper, Council of Great Lakes Industries, Ann Arbor, Michigan; Andy Buchsbaum, National Wildlife Foundation, Reston, Virginia, on behalf of the Healing Our Waters—Great Lakes Coalition; Diane Katz, Mackinac Center for Public Policy, Midland, Michigan; and William G. Howland, Lake Champlain Basin Program, Grand Isle, Vermont.

CUNO AND COMPETITIVENESS

Committee on Finance: Subcommittee on International Trade held a hearing to examine the decision in the case of Cuno v. DaimlerChrysler (relating to an agreement between DaimlerChrysler with Toledo, Ohio, and two school districts to construct a new vehicle assembly plant in exchange for approximately $280 million in tax incentives), and its impact on domestic and international competitiveness, and a related measure, S. 1066, to authorize the States (and subdivisions thereof), the District of Columbia, territories, and possessions of the United States to provide certain tax incentives to any person for economic development purposes, receiving testimony from Senator Voinovich; Peter D. Enrich, Northeastern University School of Law, Boston, Massachusetts; Harley T. Duncan, Federation of Tax Administrators, Washington, D.C.; Walter Hellerstein, University of Georgia School of Law, Athens; Peter Fisher, University of Iowa, Iowa City; and James H. Renzas, Location Management Services, Mission Viejo, California.

Hearings recessed subject to the call.

APPROPRIATIONS EARMARK REFORM

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, and International Security concluded a hearing to examine S. 1495, and related provisions of H.R. 1642, bills to prohibit Federal agencies from obligating funds for appropriations earmarks included only in congressional reports, focusing on the need for earmark reform and legislation that would be an important step toward achieving such reform, after receiving testimony from Senator McCain; Representative Flake; Thomas A. Schatz, Citizens Against Government Waste, Steve Ellis, Taxpayers for Common Sense Action, and Scott Lilly, Center for American Progress, all of Washington, D.C.

PUBLIC HEALTH SECURITY AND BIOTERRORISM PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE ACT

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the proposed reauthorization of Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act relating to enhancing public health and medical preparedness, after receiving testimony from Michael O. Leavitt, Secretary of Health and Human Services; Leah Devlin, North Carolina Division of Public Health, Raleigh, on behalf of the Association of State and Territorial Health Officials; A. Richard Melton, Utah Department of Health, Salt Lake City; and Richard A. Falkenrath, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.; and Dan Hanfling, Inova Health System, Falls Church, Virginia.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of John F. Clark, of Virginia, to be Director of the United States Marshals Service, and David F. Kustoff, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Tennessee, both of the Department of Justice.

Also, Committee continued markup of proposed legislation providing for comprehensive immigration reform, but did not complete action thereon, and will meet again on Monday, March 27.

HOMELESS VETERANS PROGRAMS

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the homeless programs and services administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs, after receiving testimony from Peter H. Dougherty, Director, Homeless Veterans Programs, Department of Veterans Affairs; Charles S. Ciccolella, Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment and Training; Philip F. Mangano, Executive Director, United States Interagency Council on Homelessness; Michael Blecker, Swords to Plowshares, San Francisco, California, on behalf of the National Coalition of Homeless Veterans; Alan Belcher, Transitional Living Services, Woodstock, Illinois; and Thomas R. Cantwell, Jr., Cloudbreak Development, LLC, Inglewood, California, on behalf of U.S. VETS.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 40 public bills, H.R. 4972–5011; 1 private bill, H.R. 5012; and 12 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 359–360, 362–364; and H. Res. 729–735, were introduced. **Pages H1127–30**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H1130–31**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 4709; to amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen protections for law enforcement officers and the public by providing criminal penalties for the fraudulent acquisition or unauthorized disclosure of phone records (H. Rept. 109–395); Supplementary Report and Document Annex by the Select Bipartisan Committee to Investigate the Preparation for and Response to Hurricane Katrina (H. Rept. 109–396); and

H. Res. 685, requesting the President and directing the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in their possession relating to any entity with which the United States has contracted for public relations purposes concerning Iraq, adversely (H. Rept. 109–397). **Page H1127**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Miller of Michigan to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1063**

Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006: The House passed H.R. 4939, to make emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, by a yea-and-nay vote of 348 yeas to 71 nays, Roll No. 65. The bill was also considered yesterday, March 15. **Pages H1067–74, H1074–H1118**

Rejected the Hinchey motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 188 ayes to 233 noes, Roll No. 64. **Pages H1116–17**

Yesterday it was agreed by unanimous consent to limit further amendments offered and the time for debate on such amendments.

Agreed to:

Burton of Indiana amendment that designates funding to Columbia to be used for illicit drug interdiction operations (by a recorded vote of 250 ayes to 172 noes, Roll No. 45), a recorded vote was requested on yesterday after debate and rolled until today; **Pages H1067–68**

Capuano amendment that increases for peacekeeping and civilian protection in Darfur, Sudan (by a recorded vote of 213 ayes to 208 noes, Roll No. 46), a recorded vote was requested on yesterday after debate and rolled until today; **Page H1068**

Taylor of Mississippi amendment that increases funding for the Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps account, and to increase funding for the Military Construction, Air Force account (by a recorded vote of 250 ayes to 171 noes, Roll No. 54), a recorded vote was requested on yesterday after debate and rolled until today; **Pages H1073–74**

Jindal amendment that reduces and increases funding for VA offset from FEMA disaster relief; **Page H1084**

Lee amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds from being available to enter into a basing rights agreement between the United States and Iraq. **Pages H1107–10**

Rejected:

Doggett amendment (No. 8 printed in the Congressional Record of March 14th) that sought to increase the funds for the Department of State Diplomatic and Consular Programs to be used to reinforce the federal levees on the Rio Grande (by a recorded vote of 198 ayes to 221 noes, Roll No. 47), a recorded vote was requested on yesterday after debate and rolled until today; **Pages H1068–69**

Garrett amendment which sought to reduce the funding for Diplomatic and Consular Programs (by a recorded vote of 75 ayes to 344 noes, Roll No. 48), a recorded vote was requested on yesterday after debate and rolled until today; **Pages H1069–70**

Garrett amendment which sought to strike funding for Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs (by a recorded vote of 78 ayes to 343 noes, Roll No. 49), a recorded vote was requested on yesterday after debate and rolled until today; **Page H1070**

Foxx amendment which sought to strike the section relating to International Broadcasting Operations, which provides funding for Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (by a recorded vote of 88 ayes to 333 noes, Roll No. 50), a recorded vote was requested on yesterday after debate and rolled until today; **Pages H1070–71**

Melancon amendment which sought to increase funding for Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies (by a recorded vote of 199 ayes to 215 noes, Roll No. 51), a recorded vote was requested on yesterday after debate and rolled until today; **Pages H1071–72**

Jefferson amendment (No. 6 printed in the Congressional Record of March 14th) that sought to increase the funds for the Community Development Block Grant program. The amount appropriated by the bill for the Community Development Block Grant program is offset by reducing funding for the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Disaster Relief Fund (by a recorded vote of 174 ayes to 248 noes, Roll No. 52), a recorded vote was requested on yesterday after debate and rolled until today; **Pages H1072–73**

Jefferson amendment (No. 7 printed in the Congressional Record of March 14th) that sought to add funding for Community Development Block Grants (CDBG), thereby increasing total CDBG dollars for the states affected by the hurricanes (by a recorded vote of 210 ayes to 212 noes, Roll No. 53), a recorded vote was requested on yesterday after debate and rolled until today; **Page H1073**

Gingrey amendment that sought to reduce funding for the National Historical Preservation Fund; **Page H1086**

Sabo amendment which sought to increase funding for homeland security (by a recorded vote of 208 ayes to 210 noes, Roll No. 56); **Pages H1076–79, H1094–95**

Neugebauer amendment (No.12 printed in the Congressional Record of March 14th) that sought to eliminate all funding in Title II (by a recorded vote of 89 ayes to 332 noes, Roll No. 57); **Pages H1079–82, H1095–96**

Millender-McDonald amendment that sought to locate an additional amount for the Election Assistance Commission in the funding to remain available until expended, for grants to eligible States, for restoring and replacing supplies, materials, and equipment used in the administration of elections in the States which were damaged as a result of Hurricane Katrina or Rita (by a recorded vote of 194 ayes to 227 noes, Roll No. 58); **Pages H1082–84, H1096**

Conaway amendment that sought to strike section 3010, relating to LIHEAP (by a recorded vote of 76 ayes to 342 noes, Roll No. 59); **Pages H1087–88, H1096–97**

Waxman amendment that sought to prohibit the awarding of contracts based on data from the Defense Contract Audit Agency (by a recorded vote of 193 ayes to 225 noes, Roll No.60); **Pages H1101–04, H1110–11**

Velázquez amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds from being made available to enforce deadlines regarding economic injury disaster loan applications and physical loan applications (by a recorded vote of 201 ayes to 213 noes, Roll No. 61); **Pages H1104–05, H1111–12**

Velázquez amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds from being available to make or guarantee a loan under section 7(b) of the Small Business Act other than a loan for which the borrower is charged an interest rate in accordance with section 7(c)(5) (by a recorded vote of 200 ayes to 219 noes, Roll No. 62); and **Pages H1105–06, H1112**

Lee amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds from being available to implement, administer, or enforce the termination of the hotel and motel emergency sheltering program established by FEMA for families displaced by Hurricane Katrina and other hurricanes of the 2005 season (by a recorded vote of 189 ayes to 230 noes, Roll No. 63). **Pages H1106–07, H1112–13**

Withdrawn:

Jindal amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that sought to increase funding for reconstruction and major projects of the Department of Veterans Affairs for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricane Katrina; **Pages H1084–85**

Jindal amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that sought to reduce funding under disaster relief and to increase funding for military construction projects of the Army National Guard; and **Pages H1085–86**

Kennedy amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn which sought to provide that none of the funds provided may be used to allow entry onto the grounds of any Department of Defense installation or cemetery or Department of Veterans Affairs cemetery for the purpose of a demonstration in connection with a funeral or memorial

service or ceremony for a deceased member of the Armed Forces. **Page H1089**

Point of Order sustained against:

Hall amendment (No. 22 printed in the Congressional Record of March 15th) that sought to provide child care subsidies to children of parents who are working or enrolled in workforce activities to States currently serving a significant number of children in families adversely affected by Hurricane Katrina, without putting the child care need of temporary residents ahead of families already on waiting lists for services funded by the Child Care and Development Fund; **Pages H1074–75**

Paul amendment (No. 9 printed in the Congressional Record of March 14th) that sought to provide funding in hurricane recovery assistance for Texas. The amendment divides the funding to provide funds for housing assistance under the Agriculture and Housing and Urban Development departments, funds for the costs of uncompensated health care for hurricane victims and evacuees, and other purposes; **Pages H1075–76**

Berry amendment that sought to provide an extension of enrollment periods for Medicare benefits; **Pages H1089–92**

DeLauro amendment that sought to repeal avian flu liability provisions (agreed to sustain the ruling of the chair by a recorded vote of 223 ayes to 193 noes, Roll No. 55); **Pages H1092–94**

Kaptur amendment (No. 26 printed in the Congressional Record of March 15th) that sought to investigate the awarding and carrying out of contracts to conduct military operations and relief and reconstruction activities related to the global war on terrorism (including all activities in Afghanistan and Iraq), and Hurricane Katrina recovery, relief, and reconstruction efforts; and **Pages H1098–99**

Nadler amendment (No. 10 printed in the Congressional Record of March 14th) that sought to insert a new section laying out requirements relating to entry of ocean shipping containers into the United States. **Pages H1099–H1101**

H. Res. 725, providing for consideration of the bill was agreed to yesterday, March 15th, by a recorded vote of 218 ayes to 200 noes, Roll No. 41, after agreeing to order the previous question by a yea-and-nay vote of 224 yeas to 192 nays, Roll No. 40.

Suspensions—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures which were debated on Wednesday, March 15th:

Making available funds included in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal year 2006: S. 2320, to make available funds included in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal year 2006, by a yea-and-nay vote of 287 yeas to 128 nays, Roll No. 66—clearing the measure for the President. **Pages H1118–19**

Tax Relief Act of 2005—Motion to Instruct Conferees: The House agreed to the Tanner motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 4297, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201(b) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006, which was debated yesterday, March 15th, by a yea-and-nay vote of 222 yeas to 187 nays, Roll No. 67. **Page H1119**

Adjournment Resolution: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 361, providing for the conditional adjournment of the House and the conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate. **Page H1120**

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourn today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday, March 20, 2006, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in H. Con. Res. 361, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution. **Page H1120**

Calendar Wednesday: Agreed by unanimous consent to dispense with the Calendar Wednesday business of Wednesday, March 29, 2006. **Page H1120**

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed the Honorable Robert B. Aderholt, the Honorable Michael K. Simpson, and the Honorable Wayne T. Gilchrest to act as Speaker Pro Tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through March 28, 2006. **Page H1121**

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he notified the Congress of his transmitting a report prepared by his Administration on the National Security Strategy of the United States—referred to the Committee on Armed Services. **Page H1121**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and twenty recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1067, H1068, H1068–69, H1069–70, H1070, H1071, H1071–72, H1072, H1073, H1073–74, H1094, H1094–95, H1095–96, H1096, H1096–97, H1110–11, H1111–12, H1112, H1113, H1117, H1117–18, H1118–19, and H1119. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and at 7:27 p.m. on Thursday, March 16, pursuant to the provisions of H. Con. Res. 361, the House stands adjourned until noon on Monday, March 20, 2006,

unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of H. Con. Res. 361, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, March 28th.

Committee Meetings

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BUDGET REQUEST FOR U.S. SOUTHERN COMMAND

Committee on Armed Services: Held a hearing on the Fiscal Year 2007 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for the U.S. Southern Command. Testimony was heard from GEN Bantz J. Craddock, USA, Commander, U.S. Southern Command, Department of Defense.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BUDGET REQUEST—SPACE ACTIVITIES

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on Fiscal Year 2007 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for space activities. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Ronald M. Sega, Under Secretary; and LTG Frank G. Klotz, USAF, both with the Department of the Air Force; and Donald M. Kerr, Director, National Reconnaissance Office.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BUDGET REQUEST NAVY AND AIR FORCE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing on the Fiscal Year 2007 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Air Force Aviation Acquisition Programs. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the GAO: Michael J. Sullivan, Director, Acquisition and Sourcing Management; and Michael J. Hazard, Assistant Director, Acquisition Sourcing Management Team; and the following officials of the Department of Defense: Kenneth J. Krieg, Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology and Logistics; VADM Lewis W. Crenshaw, Jr., USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Resources, Requirements and Assessments; LTG John G. Castellaw, USMC, Deputy Commandant for Aviation, U.S. Marine Corps; and LTG Carrol H. Chandler, USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff, Air, Space and Information Operations, Plans and Requirements, U.S. Air Force.

KEY BUDGET PROCESS REFORMS

Committee on the Budget: Held a hearing on Key Budget Process Reforms. Testimony was heard from former Senator Don Nickles of Oklahoma; and from the following former Representatives: William E. Frenzel of Minnesota and Charles W. Stenholm of Texas.

MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Workforce Protections held a hearing entitled ''Mine Safety and Health: A Congressional Perspective.'' Testimony was heard from Representatives Capito, Murphy, Rahall, Davis of Alabama, Holt, Mollohan and Chandler.

ELECTRIC HEALTH RECORDS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''Legislative Proposals To Promote Electronic Health Records and a Smarter Health Information System.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Financial Services: Ordered reported, as amended, the following bills: H.R. 3997, Financial Data Protection Act 2005; and H.R. 4973, Flood Insurance Reform and Modernization Act of 2006.

LEAVE NO COMPUTER SYSTEM BEHIND

Committee on Government Reform: Held a hearing entitled ''Leave No Computer System Behind: A Review of the 2006 Federal Computer Security Scorecards.'' Testimony was heard from Gregory C. Wilshusen, Director, Information Security Issues, GAO; Karen S. Evans, Administrator, Office of E-Government and Information Technology, OMB; Thomas P. Hughes, Chief Information Officer, SSA; Thomas Wiesner, Deputy Chief Information Officer, Department of Labor; Robert F. Lentz, Director, Information Assurance, Department of Defense; and Scott Charbo, Chief Information Officer, Department of Homeland Security.

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION REORGANIZATION ACT OF 2006

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Economic Security, Infrastructure Protection, and Cybersecurity approved for full Committee action, as amended, H.R. 4439, Transportation Security Administration Reorganization Act of 2005.

SAFE PORT ACT

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Economic Security, Infrastructure Protection, and Cybersecurity held a hearing on H.R. 4954, Security and Accountability for Every Port Act. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Homeland Security: Jayson Ahern, Assistant

Commissioner, Office of Field Operations, Customs and Border Protection; and CAPT. Brian Salerno, USCG, Deputy Director, Inspections and Compliance, U.S. Coast Guard; and public witnesses.

GLOBAL HUMAN RIGHTS

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Human Rights and International Operations held a hearing on Monitoring Respect for Human Rights Around the World: A Review of the Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2005. Testimony was heard from Barry Lowenkron, Assistant Secretary, Bureau for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, Department of State; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDELINES

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security held an oversight hearing on United States v. Booker: One Year Later—Chaos or Status Quo? Testimony was heard from William Mercer, Principal Associate Deputy Attorney General and U.S. Attorney General for the District of Montana, Department of Justice; Ricardo H. Hinojosa, Chairman, United States Sentencing Commission; Paul G. Cassell, Judge, U.S. District Court for the District of Utah; and a public witness.

ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT COMPLIANCE COSTS

Committee on Resources: Held a hearing on H.R. 4857, To better inform consumers regarding costs associated with compliance for protecting endangered and threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Energy: Greg Delwiche, Vice President, Environment, Fish and Wildlife, Bonneville Power Administration; and Michael S. Hacskaylo, Administrator, Western Area Power Administration; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—IMPACT OF HURRICANES ON NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM

Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on Fisheries and Oceans held an oversight hearing on the Impact of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita on the National Wildlife Refuge System. Testimony was heard from H. Dale Hall, Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; W. Parke Moore III, Assistant Secretary, Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, State of Louisiana; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—NATIONAL PARK SERVICE BUSINESS STRATEGIES

Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks held an oversight hearing entitled ''National Park Service business strategies, including the development and implementation of National Park Service business plans.'' Testimony was heard from Bruce Sheaffer, Comptroller, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; and a public witness.

EPA'S SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY BUDGET PROPOSAL

Committee on Science: Subcommittee on Environment, Technology, and Standards held a hearing on EPA's Fiscal Year 2007 Science and Technology Budget Proposal. Testimony was heard from George Gray, Assistant Administrator, Office of Research and Development and Science Advisor, EPA; and public witnesses.

SMALL BUSINESS CYBER SECURITY

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform and Oversight held a hearing on the State of Small Business Security in a Cyber Economy. Testimony was heard from Cita M. Furlani, Acting Director, Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce; Larry D. Johnson, Special Agent in Charge, Criminal Investigative Division, United States Secret Service, Department of Homeland Security; Lydia Parnes, Director, Bureau of Consumer Protection, FTC; Steven M. Martinez, Deputy Assistant Director, Cyber Division, FBI, Department of Justice; and public witnesses.

PIPELINE SAFETY

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Highways, Transit and Pipelines held an oversight hearing on Pipeline Safety. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Transportation: Brigham McCown, Acting Administrator, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Administration; and Todd J. Zinser, Acting Inspector General; Kate Siggerud, Director, Physical Infrastructure Issues, GAO; Robert J. Chipkevich, Director, Office of Railroad, Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety, National Transportation Safety Board; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—VA COMPENSATION/PENSION BENEFITS

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs held an oversight hearing on the accuracy of benefits information provided to, and the quality of service received by, individuals calling into the Veterans Benefits Administration. Testimony was heard from Jack McCoy, Associate Deputy Under Secretary, Policy and Management, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and representatives of veterans organizations.

USE OF TAX-PREFERRED BOND FINANCING

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures held a hearing on the Use of Tax-Preferred Bond Financing. Testimony was heard from Representatives Shaw and Brady of Texas; Eric Solomon, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Tax Policy, Department of the Treasury; Donald Marron, Acting Director, CBO; and public witnesses.

SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER HIGH-RISK ISSUES

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Social Security continued hearings on Social Security Number High-Risk Issues. Testimony was heard from the following officials of SSA: Patrick P. O'Carroll, Inspector General; and Frederick G. Streckewald, Assistant Deputy Commissioner, Disability and Income Security Programs; and public witnesses.

BRIEFING—GLOBAL/UPDATES

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Met in executive session to receive a briefing on Global/Updates. The Committee was briefed by departmental witnesses.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT AND DOCUMENT ANNEX

Select Bipartisan Committee To Investigate the Preparation for and Response to Hurricane Katrina: Ordered reported the Select Committee's Supplementary Report and Document Annex.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 17, 2006

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No committee meetings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

1 p.m., Monday, March 27

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of S. 2349, Legislative Transparency and Accountability Act. Also, Senate expects to vote at 5:30 p.m. on a matter relative to the bill.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

2 p.m., Tuesday, March 28

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday, March 28: To be announced.

(Senate proceedings for today will be continued in the next issue of the Record.)

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202–512–1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1–888–293–6498 (toll-free), 202–512–1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202–512–1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record,* U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.